The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XX | New York, Wednesday, September 17, 1919 | Number 254

Contents

The Week 184

Leading Editorials

Pershing 186
Establishing a Precedent 186
Coming Home to Roost 188
Wilson on Russia 189
Light from the Lawyers 190
A Good Chance to Start Right 191
On the Door Step 191
Production and Cost of Living 192

General Articles

For a Department of State ..... Walter Lippmann 194
Schools ..... James Weber Linn 197
The Critic and the Criticized ..... Francis Hackett 198
General Smuts: Statesman 200
The Value of Japanese Promises . James Thayer Addison 202

A Communication 206

Correspondence 207

Reviews of Books

Prophecy and Authority ..... K. L. 208
Ludwig Lewisohn's Criticism ..... Rebecca West 208
A Not Impossible Religion ..... A. W. V. 210
Cheero 211
Mummery 211
The Disabled Soldier ..... Kathleen Goldsmith 211

The Week

IT is not likely that the Democratic Senators who have come around to advocacy of amendments were led to this step by a feeling that Mr. Wilson's tour was a failure. But had his trip shown any marks of a triumph these Senators would scarcely have come out so boldly against the policy of ratification which they have always been supposed to favor. The bolt of Mr. Shields, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Hoke Smith makes some amendment of the treaty almost certain. For Republicans of the "mild reservation" group, like Mr. Kenyon and Mr. Capper, have also announced themselves substantially satisfied with the program of reservations drawn by the Committee on Foreign Relations. Perhaps it is Mr. Wilson's failure to call a halt on Allied support of reactionary movements in Hungary, Russia, Poland and other lands that is most responsible for a growing belief in the Senate, still vague, that a League to enforce the present treaty may prove only another Holy Alliance.

AUSTRIA was certain to accept any peace treaty the Allies chose to give her. For a while her statesmen might plead injustice but in the end there was nothing for them except surrender. Of the terms which the Austrian Assembly has now accepted we have not had a full report. But the summary of the treaty shows that it hands over many hundreds of thousands of German-Austrians to alien states, particularly of Czechoslovakia, and that it follows a dangerous precedent set in the Germany treaty by fixing an indefinite figure for Austria's indemnity. Against a union of Austria and Germany French influence has from the first been active. And there has accordingly been written into the new treaty a specific provision against the much advertised doctrine of self-determination.

THE Allied reply to Austria furnishes one particularly good instance of how a principle can be made to cut two ways. "As regards the Tyrol," says the Peace Conference note, "the Allied and Associated powers have been impressed by the fact that for decades the Italian people have suffered from a menace deliberately placed at their heart by the retention in Austro-Hungarian hands of military outposts commanding the Italian plains." Strategic frontiers, says the Conference, are of vital importance. And accordingly Italy is given the line "she has long demanded."

BUT in the paragraph immediately following—refusing Austria's demand for strategic frontiers of her own—the Peace Conference note declares "The Allied and Associated powers would further remind the Austrian delegation that the treaty of peace makes special provisions for the protection of small communities, such as new Austria. It will no longer be possible for powerful empires to threaten with impunity the political and economic life of their lesser neighbors." In other words, it is only the powerful empires that need strategic frontiers—and they are to have them. The little states, where strategic frontiers would presumably be pardonable, are to be satisfied with the guarantee of a League of Nations upon which the larger Powers feel it unsafe to rely.

RUMANIA has a ready answer to the ultimatum of the Peace Conference. If the Allies insist that she stop her plundering in Hungary and take her troops home, Rumania "may be obliged to consider the advantages of withdrawing her troops across the Dvina, in southern Rus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sia, and declining all responsibility for the chaos to which that part of Europe may be reduced by the dissensions of the Bolsheviki, royalists and reactionaries." That is, Rumania threatens to drop out of the anti-Bolshevik crusade unless she is to be recompensed by the privilege of despoiling Hungary at her pleasure. To the diplomats in Paris this may look like blackmail. But why, after all, is it not a perfectly sound answer? Rumania wants to know why it is wrong for her to send troops into Hungary if it is right for England, France and America to send troops into Russia. Are the little victors not to share with the great ones the privilege of intervention?

DEBATE in the French Chamber shows that there are some Deputies who do not think France gets as much from the peace treaty as England and Japan. What is most interesting to Americans in this discussion is the argument used by government spokesmen to convert their critics to ratification. We have only fragmentary accounts of the debate; but M. Tardieu and his colleagues seem to be banking heavily on the proposed Anglo-Franco-American Alliance. Reports of their speeches do not indicate that they regard this treaty as something entirely temporary—an impression held by Mr. Wilson. It is rather to be the foundation stone of French diplomacy on the Continent. Inasmuch as the alliance itself contains no clause setting a date of termination, the least that the Senate can do before taking action on a treaty so subversive of American tradition and the principles of a world League is to secure from England and France a statement of the period for which they believe the alliance is to remain operative.

APPARENTLY the treaty with Bulgaria is to be completed without any settlement for the quarrel in Thrace. Mr. Wilson's proposals seem to have been rejected. They did not give enough to Greece. And Greece, being on the winning side, saw no reason why the principle that gave Shantung to Japan and the Saar mines to France should not be carried into the Balkans. With no decision reached in Thrace, with Rumania and Serbia quarrelling for the Banat, Montenegro on the edge of revolution, and Albania protesting against the spoliation of her territory, the Balkans have a peace that is not far from war. It was never an easy task to draw boundary lines in southeastern Europe. Delay, and the example of spoils-seeking set by the larger states, have now put a peaceful solution of Balkan questions farther off than ever.

THE most important issue before the British Trade Union Congress now in session is the question of political action versus the direct method of the strike. When Mr. Lloyd George rejected the Sankey report for nationalization of the coal-mines he threw down a plain challenge to the trade unions. The miners have already refused the program offered by the government in place of nationalization. But what weapon they will use to force government ownership will be largely determined by debate in the present conference. Resort to direct action to achieve a political aim is a policy urged by those who consider that control of publicity by the government and the conservative press makes political action an unreality. But Mr. Henderson advises British labor to conceive itself in power, and then to contemplate the use by its opponents of methods that are unconstitutional.

ALLIED activity in Archangel is summed up in a remarkable statement issued by Lt.-Col. Sherwood Kelly, commander of the 2d Battalion of the Hampshire Regiment (British Expeditionary Forces). Colonel Kelly declares that he volunteered for service in Russia "in the sincere belief that this was needed to make possible the withdrawal of British troops," but that "immediately after our arrival in Archangel we received the impression that the policy of our officials was not what it was stated to be. . . . We discovered that the much vaunted 'loyal Russian army' was composed largely of Bolshevik prisoners dressed in khaki, utterly unreliable and always constituting a greater menace to our troops than the Bolshevik army opposing them. This was tragically demonstrated when the Russians mutinied and murdered their British officers."

IT is unfortunate that Senator McCormick has so drawn his resolution for the recall of American troops that it applies both to Siberia and to Europe. To be sure, those soldiers who are to remain in Germany are too few to be of great practical service; they are there, not as a symbol of the League of Nations, but as an assurance to the French that America will remain interested in the attempted enforcement of an unworkable treaty. Nevertheless it is a misfortune that in Mr. McCormick's resolution these men are coupled with the troops in Siberia. For every argument in support of the resolution can now be easily twisted. Those who defend the use of American troops in Russia will base their opposition to Mr. McCormick's proposal on the ground that it would be a betrayal of Foch and the French army on the Rhine.

WITH Mr. McCormick's demand that our troops be brought home from Siberia all American liberals will be in sympathy. The official assumption upon which these troops are being detained is that they are keeping the railways open for the Red Cross and other relief organizations. But they are also keeping the roads open for Japanese troops and American munitions that are to be used in a cause to which the United States has given neither its legal nor moral support. The argument that we must aid the work of the Red Cross would stand on sounder ground if simultaneously we should put a ban on Japanese troops and American shells. So long as American troops remain in Siberia we are giving comfort to the enemies of Russian freedom who cluster in Tokio, Paris and Omsk.

ACTION by the American trade unions shows a growing hostility to the policy of Mr. Wilson's administration in Russia. In June the national convention of the American Federation of Labor was content with a half-way position. It dodged the issue of raising the blockade. But since June there has been a rising protest against the continuation of the blockade and the use of American troops in Siberia. Resolutions against this sort of intervention have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adopted by many trade union bodies—among others, by the New York Federation of Labor, the Women's Trade Union League, the United Shoe Workers, and the Labor parties of New York and Chicago. Opposition to our present Russian policy will continue to grow with the postponement of a military decision and the gradual realization, by Americans, of the enormity of our responsibility for helping to kill non-combatants with an embargo.

AS we go to press it is uncertain what the results are to be of Mr. Wilson's promised intervention in the dispute between the Steel Corporation and the trade unions. The President agreed to try what the trade unions had failed to do: to get a hearing from Mr. Gary. Union leaders have informed Mr. Wilson that they do not know how long they can hold the rank and file in check. The prevention of meetings and the discharge of union members, they say, "have brought about such a situation that it is difficult to withhold or restrain the indignation of the men, and the resistance that they declare it is their purpose to present." In some quarters this warning will be regarded as a bluff. But the action of the California railwaymen and of the West Virginia miners—completely disregarding the edicts of their leaders—is a hint that the rank and file of labor is indeed the active force behind the various demands that the trade unions are now presenting.

Pershing

ONE of the men who was closest to Pershing throughout the war remarked recently that a republic had always to be afraid of being conquered by its conquering army, but that in Pershing, happily, the nation had found a soldier who wished only to be a soldier. His record in France is testimony to the truth of it. His instinct as to what was the true role of an American commander, whether in relation to his political chiefs, or to the French people, or the beaten enemy, was superb. He organized and commanded the A. E. F., cooperated with the Allies but maintained a useful independence, and acted with sincere understanding of the fact that the soldier executes but does not make high policy. He neither bragged nor truckled, and though he had to endure a fair amount of intrigue and jealousy, he emerges untarnished and impressive. He commanded not only well but in fine spirit. In all history there has probably never been a cleaner army, a more single-minded army, a less factional army, or considering its previous preparations, a more effective army. He did not alone make it what it was, to be sure, but because of him it was possible to make it what it was. The spirit which prevails at the top radiates through the whole military hierarchy. Judged by the results, and they alone count here, Pershing has proved himself fully competent for the most delicate command ever entrusted to an American general. He succeeds in every essential part of his huge task.

It does not matter whether he originated or accepted the underlying policies on which the A. E. F. was organized. The policies finally adopted proved to be sound. The organization was conceived, as it ought to have been, on a larger scale than the occasion required. It was an organization that through all its infinite ramifications produced an ever-increasing and finally overwhelming supply of battle troops. The possibilities of fatal error were great. In all big matters they were avoided. Only an extraordinary grasp of what was important and a superb imagination can account for so successful a discrimination in the helter skelter of advice which was thrust upon him. There were to be sure minor failures at many points. Examination of them will show, we imagine, that they were due to one of two things—to a lack of intellectual preparation by the General Staff before America entered the war, and to a vice, really the defects of a virtue, prevalent in all classes of Americans which makes them prefer ingenuity to experience. Time was probably lost in experimentation which should either have taken place during the period of neutrality or been omitted altogether. One gathers a very definite impression that somehow the experience of the Allies was not digested soon enough, and this was costly in time and therefore in lives. None of this bears on Pershing who throughout has been a general in the field, except to bring into still stronger relief the high ability which he displayed. Through him the American part in the war was brought to its focus on the western front.

On him the exultation is now focused. It is meant not only for Pershing but for a multitude of whom he is not only a most engaging representative, but in every sense a leader. It should extend to Baker who picked him and sustained him and helped to temper him, to the fierce energies of March, to the finely dependable Bliss, to the responsible and ingenious Crowder. That it extends to the combat troops above all others needs hardly to be said.

Establishing a Precedent

POLITICS sometimes seem like an unending series of Hobson's choices. If you take what is called a liberal line, you may find yourself playing more or less the same game as Senator Reed or Mr. Hearst. If you take a conservative attitude you may become indistinguishable from Mr. Ochs. Providing such things matter, you won't

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be comfortable either way. It takes a special political aptitude to work yourself into the frame of mind where you believe that all the angels are on your side and all the devils on the other. In politics no such division exists.

The professional politician takes this for granted and acts on it. He decides that a certain bill must be carried, or a certain treaty ratified. The world immediately divides itself morally into men of vision and blind men, or more simply into good men and bad men, and then let the bad men beware. Any argument for the project is a good argument, any argument against is a bad one. In sharpest contrast to the professional politician is the purist. For him no cause is altogether righteous that is not defended solely by righteous men with scrupulously honest arguments. When the politician is entirely centered on his object, almost regardless of method, the purist will tend to sacrifice his end to protect his method. He will excommunicate those who support him for the wrong reasons, and dissociate himself from allies who have different ultimate aims in view.

For the politician this at least is to be said: that to be too scrupulous as politics is played is to be completely impotent, and to end as the prophet of a dwindling cult. But there is this to be said for the purist: that while the value of any piece of legislation, of any concrete project, is always dubious and rarely as great as the expectation, the habits formed in a community are what make or mar it. The means employed in one case will effect the choice of means in the next, as Germany's career up to the war indicates. The attainment of a good end, German unity, by foul means, wars of aggression, does not vindicate itself. This is more than ever true in a community which calls itself a democracy. The critical assets and liabilities of a self-governing people are its intellectual and moral dispositions. If they become corrupted, no scheme however brilliantly it may be conceived is worth the price.

Take the President's speaking tour. Pressed and harassed, he may think it desirable to jam through a ratification under any circumstances. In fact the value of that ratification will depend wholly on the tradition in regard to the treaty and the league which is now in process of birth. So one would wish that he had chosen to argue his case with sufficient candor and sufficient scruple not to mislead a people inevitably inexperienced in the matters at issue. The President has a strong case and a comparatively easy one to argue. He can point out that the circumstances of European politics made him choose between accepting a dangerous peace and the uncertainties of no peace at all. He can argue that the restoration of order will make possible a revision of the settlement, and that it is to America's interest as well as Europe's that the United States should participate in the revision. He can point out that amendments throwing the treaty back to the same conference which has already botched this one will do no good, and that it is better to postpone revision for a year or two. Finally that in any case, the right of withdrawal amply protects all that the reservations of Mr. Lodge are intended to protect.

An argument made that way would be extremely persuasive and might even be convincing. Why then object to what Mr. Wilson is doing? It comes to the same thing, doesn't it? No, it doesn't. The dangerous thing about this treaty from the point of view of American interests is that under it we break faith as a nation, and accept the expediencies of European diplomacy as our own. All this may have been necessary. It might not have been had Mr. Wilson been a shrewder diplomat than he is—nevertheless, for all practical purposes it may have been inevitable. Granted that, it becomes of the utmost importance that the American people should understand what has happened. They should not break pledges without knowing they have broken them; they should not unconsciously be beguiled by the European foreign offices. For unless we enter the League without illusions, without sentimentality, and without pretence, we shall do nobody any good by our participation.

In this respect the President is not serving his countrymen well. He is not telling them the whole truth. He is not permitting them to see what this treaty reveals, and he is asking them to plunge blindly. He is using all his great powers to prevent the American people from preparing themselves intellectually and morally for the grave and intricate and explosive matters which are contained in this treaty. Instead of taking the candid course of explanation he has chosen to climb on the highest horse available and to proceed with a gallop. His victory would not mean a triumph for the League of Nations, but simply a political victory over the Republican opposition.

In like manner ratification with reservations will not mean that the true dangers of the Treaty have been revealed and scotched. But it will mean that a representative body has intervened in the secrecy of Paris, and established the precedent by which legislatures can participate in foreign affairs. What is written in Mr. Lodge's reservations is far less interesting than is the fact that the most conservative of Republicans are engaged in establishing the habit of legislative criticism directed against the governing executives of the world. It matters not at all whether these executives are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called the Big Five or the Council of the League of Nations.

They will have to be taught that what they do is not to be automatically approved because it would be so very inconvenient not to approve. And so the more self-righteous Mr. Wilson becomes about the Treaty, just so much the stronger is the intrinsic argument for neither taking it nor leaving it as he directs.

Coming Home to Roost

THERE is something clearly objectionable in the method that Messrs. Walsh and Dunne have employed to get to the public their confidential talk with President Wilson in Paris on June 11th. They went to see him in regard to the claims of Ireland on the Peace Conference, and their discussion with him was ostensibly a private discussion. They had no stenographer with them, nor had President Wilson a stenographer of his own. When they came away they wrote down their version of what was said, and this version they have now filed as " confidential memoranda " with the Senate committee on foreign relations. In the same confidential spirit, apparently, the Senate committee has revealed the memoranda to the newspapers, who in turn have confidentially published it.

This procedure, we say, is clearly objectionable. At the same time, what other procedure was left open to Messrs. Walsh and Dunne by the exponent of open diplomacy with whom they were dealing? Messrs. Walsh and Dunne were in Paris to seek the application to Ireland of the principles for which the Allies and the United States had struggled in the war. As a preliminary to this effort in Paris they had visited Ireland and there they had preached the principles of the Allies and Woodrow Wilson. In doing this, as Mr. Wilson observed to them, they had offended the whole British government. Having brought the wrath of the British government on their heads by preaching the Allied principles in Ireland, they found themselves unable to reach the Big Four in Paris, and they had considerable difficulty in seeing Mr. Wilson.

And on what terms were they to be allowed to see Mr. Wilson? On the terms, presumably, of a private, unofficial, confidential delegation having a private, unofficial, confidential chat about the political destiny of more than four million people? There was no other way in which the President would or perhaps even could see these American citizens regarding Ireland. When he did see them he made it a point over and over again not to treat their issue as a living issue or an issue relevant to the principles that he had preached. He acknowledged those principles. He acknowledged that he had said that the issues of the war " must be settled by no arrangement or compromise or adjustment of interests, but *definitely and once for all,* and with a full and unequivocal acceptance of the principle that the interest of the weakest is as safe as the interest of the strongest." He acknowledged that these unequivocal words had raised hope in the hearts of millions of people—and then he washed his hands, he refused to discuss his principles, he refused to discuss Lloyd George in relation to his principles, he refused to speak " officially," he expressed surprise that " any considerable number of people, when they read my declarations, thought that these settlements were to be made at some particular place, automatically, immediately."

The fact that these declarations had " raised hope in the hearts of millions of people " Mr. Wilson deplored, according to Frank Walsh, as "a metaphysical tragedy." He could not understand why his aspirations were not understood and interpreted as vague, pious, passive aspirations. He did not see why, when he was pledging justice to *all* peoples and nationalities, that people could think he meant anything except faraway millennial justice toward which he was assuming no real responsibility.

Mr. Walsh read Mr. Wilson these famous Wilsonian utterances:

> Peace should rest upon the rights of peoples, not on the rights of Governments—the rights of peoples, great and small, weak or powerful, their equal rights to freedom and security and self-government and to participation, upon fair terms, in the economic opportunities of the world.
>
> It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak. Unless this principle be made its foundation, no part of the structure of international justice can stand.

Yes, but the fact that people based *actual* hopes on such utterances remained for Mr. Wilson a metaphysical or psychic tragedy.

Dealing with a man so labyrinthine in verbal resource, what could Messrs. Walsh and Dunne believe or suppose? They found that, so far as Ireland was concerned, he had been pinned down nowhere. He had pledged himself in fine phrases, he released himself in smooth ones. He spoke of Messrs. Walsh and Dunne " fomenting rebellion " since they dared to give actual application to his own words. He spoke of their " offensiveness," using the current conventional British phrase. And he maintained, or is said by Mr. Walsh to have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maintained, that they had actually hampered him in certain vast and vague "unofficial" efforts to help Ireland.

When they spoke to him of principles, he became a practical man. When they spoke to him practically, he became a man of principle. And there they were.

In response to such tactics, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Dunne have crudely sought publicity and the public verdict. Their accuracy or at any rate their realism in reporting Mr. Wilson can scarcely fail of its effect. Many McGraths, McGuires, Meaneys, Meehans, Monahans, Morans—to take a few names from the New York World war tablet just unveiled—enlisted and fought for Wilsonian justice under the impression that it was to have tangible and workable results even for Ireland. His words implied it. They faced gas and shrapnel in another sense than the metaphysical and they expect something from the Peace Conference other than metaphysical comment. Is everyone in their position to be disappointed? They are likely to take disappointment exceedingly hard.

Wilson on Russia

WOODROW WILSON was once an historian. He was not, perhaps, distinguished for assiduous devotion to his muse, but he acknowledged obeisance to the rules she had laid down since old times. If it was ever necessary for him to employ a fact, instead of rhetoric, he was at some pains to assure himself that the fact existed. If it was necessary for him to institute a comparison between two historical phenomena, he acknowledged the obligation of illuminating his criticism with the light of attendant circumstance. He recognized himself as an imposing figure in the assemblies of his craft, but he knew that this fact did not make it safe for him to occupy positions out of which the veriest tyro could rout him, to the laughter of the whole confraternity of scholars. But all that has changed now. Woodrow Wilson is no longer the servant of history, but has become her master.

And so he stands up bravely before her and asserts that the Soviet regime in Russia is more cruel than was that of the Tsar. Does any one imagine that Woodrow Wilson ever made the least effort to ascertain the facts of either term of his comparison? Does he know how general was the use of "Stolypin's neckties" in the suppression of the liberal revolution of 1906? Has he any acquaintance with the statistics of Siberian exile, or any knowledge of the conditions under which transportation to Siberia was carried on? Has he examined the relation between Tsaristic officialdom and such affairs as the massacre of Kishinev? No, of course not; he has been too busy. But of course he knows all about the spirit and the practice of the Soviet regime? No: he has been too busy to inform himself. He was too busy to listen to Raymond Robins, Colonel Thompson, Mr. Thacher. He has been too busy to listen to anything but carefully selected and prepared reports justifying the policy he had already adopted under British and French pressure. He dared not trust his virginal innocence of Russian conditions alone with that bold fellow the truth.

But say that Woodrow Wilson could demonstrate, by historical, not propagandistic methods, that the Soviet regime, conducting a revolution, had caused more suffering in a given time than the Tsaristic regime, conducting the civil affairs of a peaceful nation—what is the moral? Did the corrupt government of King George the Third occasion a tithe of the suffering in America that attended the Revolution? Did the government of Louis XVI revel in excesses to be compared with those of the French Revolution? Did Oliver Cromwell and his Ironsides effect a painless improvement in British affairs? Was it quite without pain and slaughter that Mexico ejected "the tyrant Huerta?" Whose phrase was that, we wonder?

Revolution is a hideous, bloody business, and we can understand though we cannot sympathize with the feelings of those gentlemen who believe there ought never to be revolutions, however incrusted the tyrannies against which they are directed. Every revolution we have ever heard of has gone too far. It has yielded at times to sheer blood lust. But is that a reason for backing the counter-revolution? Suppose that the combined European potentates of 1790—whom Woodrow Wilson would no doubt call tyrants, being safely buried—had succeeded in overthrowing the French Revolution, would the roll of executions have been brief and pleasant reading? If our friends Kolchak and Denikin get into the heart of Russia, does any one doubt that heart will spout blood generously? Revolutions have always been terrible; counter-revolutions more terrible. That is history, but what is history to Woodrow Wilson?

The Soviet rule, says Woodrow Wilson, is the rule of a minority. So it is. There are, he says, only 34 men who share among them the control of the political destinies of Russia. Well, it is not so long since four men were assembled at Paris, hearing and determining on the policies of the world. How many men in America have participated in the formation of the policy of war on Russia, and a blockade more terrible than war?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One, unless you count rubber stamps. But by the constitution one man is empowered to act for the whole people in this matter? No, that is just where our constitution is too democratic for Woodrow Wilson. Find, if you can, any clause in it by which American forces can carry on war in Siberia without congressional action.

Still, has not the Soviet government been challenged to convene a constitutional convention based on universal suffrage, to determine whether a majority wishes the Soviet form of government or another form? To be sure. It is a pity that Woodrow Wilson did not live in the seventeenth century, to challenge Oliver Cromwell to convene a constituent assembly. That would have called the doughty Oliver's bluff; for there is not a shadow of doubt that the majority of the British people would slavishly have voted for the restoration of the Stuarts and the execution of Cromwell. Perhaps the British revolutionists would not have bowed their necks obediently to the will of the majority and to the ax, but in that case men like Woodrow Wilson could not have had to idealize such uncouth disturbers. It is a pity that Wilson could not have sent the challenge of a constituent assembly to Washington at Valley Forge. The way Washington would have received it would be interesting to the historian, if any one had lived to report it. Mirabeau and Danton, Marat and Robespierre could have lost nothing by a universally elected assembly but their necks, and those were forfeit any way. But the real work of the revolution, which the historians unite in pronouncing good—how would that have fared?

And while Woodrow Wilson is so bent on denying even provisional legitimacy to any Russian regime that is not based on a constituent assembly —except the regime of Kolchak, Denikin and Co. —why does he not look about him, like an historian, and discover the basis of other existing government? What is the basis of the governments of Japan, Italy, England even? At what point in the history of those governments do we find a plebiscite or a constituent assembly? And if we are to challenge the Soviet regime in Russia, on the ground that it is a minority rule, why not also the Japanese regime in Korea, the British regime in India? Or does it sanctify minority rule that it is altogether alien?

Revolutions, so history calmly asserts, are always affairs of the minority. In every society those are always in a minority who are ready to die for their opinions. All, or almost all, may feel oppressed, but only a few will take the risk of striking for liberty. And those few who are willing to die, but would rather live, will not immediately surrender to the indifferent and nerveless majority the power of determining whether themselves and the fruits of their labors shall live or perish. If they can, they will hold power until the new state which they have wrought has attained to the character of a normally stable state. So history asserts, but Woodrow Wilson is history's master. We envy him the sense of power he must enjoy as he yanks his former mistress around by the hair. But it occurs to us that he is overlooking one rather important consideration. She will have the last word.

Light from the Lawyers

DESPITE some popular and remarkably ancient witticisms against lawyers, it cannot truthfully be said that they are as a rule less enlightened or even less liberal than the members of any other profession. But when they get together in their annual Bar Association meetings they certainly evince an extraordinary capacity for mixing solemn nonsense with unmitigated Bourbonism. A few years ago the New York Bar Association actually thought it could settle questions of history by voting certain resolutions, and now a committee of the American Bar Association returns to the old fight against the recall of judges with a report that is as deficient in legal scholarship as it is full of vehemently cheap rhetoric. We can understand how busy lawyers can take as axiomatic, propositions which have been characterized as childish by scholarly jurists since Austin, but why should members of a learned profession think that they can refute opposing arguments by indiscriminate brandishing of the terrible word socialism? Did not a noted British statesman say years ago that we are all socialists? Even more distressingly out of harmony with Senator Root's call to the members of the Bar Association to educate the public, is the solemn repetition by the committee of the scandalous falsehood as to the nationalization of women by the Lenin government. Even those who justify the occasional use of pious lies, must admit that it is hardly wise for lawyers to repeat what has been officially denied by our own state department. If the leaders of the American bar really care to maintain general respect for law they ought to put a stop to the annual intellectual lynching parties which is all their committees on the recall of judicial decisions and the recall of judges amount to. They give the outside public the unfortunate impression that lawyers are less sensitive to fine qualities of justice than to a possible loss of their own prestige, by shifting final decisions from the forum of legality to the forum of the general community sense of right and justice.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Good Chance to Start Right

IN Southern California, on the edge of the irrigated district of the Imperial Valley, there is a tract of some 200,000 acres of land, at present arid beyond imagination, but potentially as promising as the rich oasis below, if water can be brought upon it. And water can be brought, from the Colorado River, in adequate quantity and at a cost that is not prohibitive. There is at present a bill before Congress providing for this. Why should it not be pushed through to enactment? Does anyone prefer that 200,000 acres of our national domain should lie desert, nourishing only an occasional horned lizard, when they might offer the basis for a thousand prosperous homes?

Of course not; but it behooves us to be on our guard lest a gulf appear between the public enterprise of reclaiming the desert and the public enterprise of planting it with prosperous homes. Such a gulf does in fact appear in the pending bill, which proposes, as if the country had learned nothing from past failures, to sell out the land to be irrigated in lots of 160 acres, in its present state of hideous desolation, and to use the proceeds to help finance the ditches. The help will not be great. Arid land, even when water is promised in the indefinite future, is a discouraging investment. A private owner will sometimes sell arid land nevertheless, because he has not the resources to bring water upon it, or wait until water is brought. But the United States is not in the position of a land poor private person. It is under no necessity of making what must in any event turn out to be a bad bargain.

The financial absurdity of the proposed plan might be condoned on the ground that we have always handled our public domain in an absurd way, from the point of view of finance. There is another objection that is more serious. The kind of man who has the ready cash to sink in arid land is not, as a rule, the kind of man who will need to live on that land, or will care to do so. When his land has become multiplied in value by the government's enterprise in bringing water, he will sell it to the actual settler, or let it to tenants. Thus when all the world is trying to get rid of the calamitous system of tenantry and the only less serious evil of farm ownership saddled with excessive initial costs, it is actually proposed in Congress to create those conditions, gratuitiously.

It is a gratuitious proceeding, because a much better way is known to everyone. The land to be irrigated lies in the state of California, which has demonstrated in a striking fashion how such a problem should be solved. By the California plan, as worked out in the colony at Durham, it has been proved feasible to plan a thriving and happy rural community, without ultimate expense to the state and with every prospect of immediate and continuous prosperity to the members of the community. And that in spite of the fact that the land upon which the settlement was established had to be acquired at a high price. Now, are we to proceed with another example of our old sloppy bungling method of handling or rather mishandling the problem of public land disposal, in the face of a state that knows a better way? That is almost unthinkable.

Let us by all means redeem those two hundred thousand acres. But let us apply the machinery for planting them with settlers that the state of California is already operating successfully. And when we have so excellent an opportunity, why should we not experiment with soldier settlements under the plan? There were tens of thousands of soldiers who indicated their desire to become settlers under the plans proposed by Secretary Lane. Are our obligations to the soldiers already extinguished or outlawed? If not, we might at least make this small start toward fulfilling them.

On the Doorstep

AN International Congress of Working Women is to be held in Washington, D. C., this October, a week before the International Labor Congress. It has a simple history. In the spring of 1919 the Women's Trade Union League sent a special commission to the Peace Conference at Paris. It consisted of Mary Anderson and Rose Schneiderman. They were to interview the Labor Commission, but they arrived too late. The Commission had adjourned. They got a copy of its report. Except for an amendment, painfully secured by the English trade union women, there was nothing in the report to indicate that women were to be consulted in the coming Labor Congress, although the agenda of the Congress provided for much discussion of women's work. And this amendment merely provided that when matters especially affecting women were to be dealt with by the Congress, one of the two advisers optional to each delegate should be a woman.

The point, as these Americans saw it, was that women would not be in any positions of authority at the coming Labor Congress, and that men, only one-fourth workers, would be formulating international standards for women's work. They therefore recommended to the June Convention of the Women's Trade Union League that "special impetus" might be given to this formulation if the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working women of the world themselves could be ready with definite and practical proposals. To get this impetus they suggested the calling of an International Working Women's Congress. The English trade union women heartily agreed to this plan and the American organization sent out the call.

This call has gone to thirty-four countries. Each has been asked to send ten women delegates. Each country will have ten votes. More significant than anything else—the delegates must bring credentials signed by accredited trade union organizations. If passport barriers are not raised, this Congress is to be the first great gathering of organized labor. Of course it will be only women labor, but as most of the delegates will come representing large bodies of voters it is fairly certain that their recommendations will be listened to in a receptive spirit.

The nature of the recommendations are not to be decided in the brief space of conference. There is nothing vague or Victorian about the questionnaire which has been sent to each organization to guide it in the preparation of material. Roughly summarized the main points are: What, in the particular country concerned, are the present laws and practices governing the employment of women before and after childbirth? The employment of women during the night? The employment of women in unhealthy processes? What legislative proposals are now under consideration? What information is available concerning the employment of children? Should fourteen years be the age limit? Night work? Unhealthy processes? And how has the country worked out two reforms affecting both men and women—the forty-eight hour week and the means of providing against unemployment?

A direct question covers every controversial point; and at the end the general question is raised as to whether it is possible to take effective international action on any of the program. Here, of course, enters the skeptic in the shape of a direct actionist. Might not these trade union women much better stay at home and mind their own political and industrial babies, they say, than run off to a congress which can only indirectly influence another congress which itself has no immediate power.

The first International Congress of Working Women needs no such justification by immediate results. Even if it has no finger at all in the formulation of international standards, or if the standards themselves are straws in the wind, this council will have the exceedingly practical effect of stimulating women trade unionists in all countries, even in those which can send no delegates. The stimulus is needed because women are still having to work together for their own protection and for the privilege of being allowed to work together with men. They must still organize for the day when they will not have to sit on the doorstep of the world's conferences.

Production and Cost of Living

WHEN the production of wealth declines, there will of course be less to divide. Somebody or everybody will find it harder to make ends meet. That is elementary. Now, the fact is that the production of material wealth is at present declining. It has been on the down grade, in this country, ever since the President, last fall, threw down the reins of economic control and invited private enterprise to find its own way home to the normal status. Perhaps this declining production is the cause of the high cost of living that is afflicting the country? That is a favorite thought of the financial writers, and apparently of the President himself. Suppose that everybody were to stop fretting and striking and go to work; would not this in itself cause the cost of living to come down at once?

Let us examine the matter point by point, a procedure made simple by the publication of that extraordinarily illuminating little document, An Analysis of the High Cost of Living Problem, submitted to the Secretary of War by the Council of National Defense. Where are our shortages? Not in wheat nor in meat. Here we have exceeded our former maximum of production. The report does not survey the milk supply, but it is safe to assume that production has not fallen away. Our coal production has fallen by about a quarter in comparison with last year. Heightened production in that direction would doubtless bring some immediate relief. The production of woolens for civilian use was at a very low ebb in the early part of the year, for the simple reason that the War Department had cornered most of the material. There is still a shortage of wool stocks and no increased zeal on the part of the shearers will mend this condition. Similarly the boot and shoe industry has fallen behind, for want of material. Matters are improving but the world shortage of leather is not soon to be overcome. The cotton industry faces a short crop, with intensified demand from abroad. Our mills, however, have not done so well as they might have done with available resources of labor and materials. It is to be suspected that it is price uncertainties which have deterred them from undertaking a more active policy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is a terrible shortage of housing in most of the large cities, and that affects the cost of living very materially. At the same time the industries supplying materials of construction were very inactive, in the early part of the year. Let them fall to, and we shall have cheaper housing—next year and later. Railway construction is at a standstill, practically; let it proceed, and we shall some day have better transportation or lower freights. The iron and steel industries have been relatively inactive this year. That implies less construction, less factory equipment, less of a thousand and one things that ultimately bear upon the cost of living. Ultimately; but the burning question today is the cost of living this month and next.

Now, there is every reason why the President and Congress should occupy themselves earnestly with the problem of increasing production. Since the armistice we have fallen far below our maximum productive capacity. The values we could and should have produced probably run up into the billions. And where we have most fallen short is exactly in those items where a prudent economy would not have made retrenchments, in buildings, machinery, railways and roads and the materials that enter into their production. That is what always has happened in times when prices were generally conceived to be abnormally high. Who wants to build a house at seventy per cent advance in cost, when the house must pay for itself in a long succeeding period of falling prices? Who wants to replace old machinery by new machinery at inflation prices? Price inflating is a fever which does its utmost to eat up the productive machinery of society. If the political doctors at Washington know any method that would be efficacious in stopping this destruction, let them by all means apply it.

But the political doctors are prescribing increased production as an alternative to higher wages, not as prophylaxis against the anemia that will overtake the industrial system if the fever runs its course. Let us consider how the prescription can work. Shall we get cheaper bread, for any increased exertions by labor in the next six months? No. Cheaper meat? No. Cheaper milk? No. Housing? No, not materially. Woolens? No. Cottons? No. Coal? Yes, somewhat. Gas, No. Electric light? No. Street car fares? No, God forbid that we expect that. We shall, however, get cheaper steam turbines as well as cheaper structural steel and rails, to relieve our household budgets.

If we do in fact stimulate the production of permanent goods, of the instruments of future production, we shall no doubt make the supply of consumable goods more abundant for future months and years, an object in every way worth attaining. But in so doing shall we not be exerting an effect upon present prices just the reverse of what we are aiming at? We want the steel industry to produce in the next six months a billion dollars' worth more than it now appears gauged to produce. That will be another billion dollars of purchasing power, in wages and profits, let loose to compete with us for the finished commodities we need. Does that look like a good prescription for reducing prices? As a fact, if we were crusading against a fall in prices we should hardly find a more promising expedient than just such stimulation of production. The greatest known stimulus to production is war. In the period of the war we not only supplied our own and the Allied armies with huge quantities of munitions, but we also broke all records in the production of food, coal, ships. And the more we produced the more prices rose.

Increased production is an excellent remedy for many and grave ills, even if it does not promise to bring prompt relief from the evil of world prices risen above the reach of the average consumer. For that evil the remedy is nearer at hand. Reduce waste in distribution, discourage speculation and profiteering wherever feasible. And when that is done, raise wages, until the relation between what the worker receives and what his necessities cost is at least as favorable as it was before the war. That will raise costs to a still higher level? Yes, but not proportionately, since wages are only one factor in cost, and the other factor, profits and overhead, need not be raised. As for production, let us by all means strive to make it more abundant, but with a view to the good things it will actually bring, not to those which we cannot reasonably expect from it.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1919, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL
WALTER E. WEYL
FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN JOHNSON
WALTER LIPPMANN
CHARLES MERZ
SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For a Department of State

SOME day or other the Senate will probably ratify the treaty with reservations, and then some day an American will go to Geneva to sit on the Council of the League of Nations. The reservations will define what he cannot do. Who will define what he must do? Instructions of some kind he will have to have, and roughly speaking there are three possibilities here. He can be given the widest possible discretion. He can take the President when he appoints himself as peace commissioner as a model. That is to say, he can go it alone, negotiate and bargain as if he had full powers, and then present Congress with a series of accomplished facts to be rejected or accepted with unimportant reservations.

The opposite role for the American councilmen at Geneva might be modelled on the part played by Mr. Frazier on the Supreme War Council at Versailles before the armistice. Roughly speaking, it was the role of reporter and messenger for Mr. Wilson. Mr. Frazier who sat, not always I believe, with the Allied Prime Ministers, could only report back to Washington. He could make no independent political decision. Though a Counsellor of the Embassy at Paris, he was independent of the Ambassador, and his wire ran straight to Washington. The difficulties of the position are obvious. European statesmen with real powers naturally find it anomalous that they should deal with a representative who has no powers. A decision from Washington based on an exchange of cables is a poor form of decision, because the determining facts are often too intricate and too subtly shaded for the clumsy mechanism of official dispatches.

The President and his Secretary of State cannot make frequent trips to Geneva, as would Mr. George and Mr. Balfour, or M. Clemenceau and M. Pichon. The permanent American representative will therefore be in a somewhat different position from that of his European colleagues. He will have less discretion than the Prime Ministers whom he must meet in time of crisis, and more discretion than the routine delegates. He has a longer and more difficult line of communication than any European. Presumably, in matters of vital policy he will reach back all the way to Washington for a decision; in matters of detail he will frequently have to act without adequate guidance from Washington. Such at least will be the theory of his powers. But in practice there is no satisfactory distinction between "detail" and "vital policy," for the vitality of a policy is usually in its critical detail.

The relation between the American at Geneva and the Department of State will determine the value of our participation in the League. The working out of that relationship is a first-rate puzzle in administration. Certain principles are, however, fairly clear. Both Geneva and Washington must, as far as possible, be simultaneously in possession of the same facts, and be actuated by the same motives. If the American at Geneva has important information about Europe that the President lacks, he cannot ask the President to decide a question in which that information is decisive. If he knows the general state of Europe, but is ignorant of the temper at Washington, he cannot advise European statesmen honorably and intelligently because of their uncertainty as to whether he is really speaking "for America." If the delegate at Geneva is moved in Central European affairs by the principle, let us say, of the cordon-sanitaire, while official Washington hopes for a nationalistic solution, endless confusion must result. The aims of policy must be common aims.

I propose, however, to put aside here the question of aims, and to deal only with that of diplomatic intelligence. This may seem a little like putting the cart before the horse, but the fact is that in practice a nation like ours cannot have aims that are reputable unless and until it knows what is going on in Europe. Genuine information would make agreement on aims comparatively easy for us, and I am confident that Americans would not be so hopelessly divided on European affairs if propaganda, censorship and downright lying had not obfuscated practically every time.

Diplomatic officials abroad have two main tasks. They must report, and they must negotiate. They must inform Washington, and when the League is set up, they will have to inform Geneva, of all that is relevant in their territory. From Washington and from Geneva they will receive instructions. These they must "execute"; that is to say, they must persuade the governments to which they are accredited that action be taken.

For the sake of clarity it may be well to discuss the relationships that are important. The diplomatic mission must be in a position to learn what is going on, not only in government circles but among the people. No one will pretend that our European diplomats during the war were tolerably

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

efficient in this. In Paris the Ambassador after many years of service achieved, I believe, a smattering of restaurant and taxicab French. Yet there was an edict in the Embassy by which he was virtually the only channel of information to the French Foreign Office. By temperament he was an incurable optimist, and the rule he set himself was to transmit to Washington only such information as would hearten the folks at home. An examination of his dispatches covering the critical periods of the war would be a good object lesson on the kind of official information on which Washington was supposed to depend. Of the embassy at Rome the most poignant fact was the profound difference in outlook between the Ambassador and the real directors of American policy. In Berne, a group of the very best young men in the diplomatic service did contrive to act as a source of information, but no one has yet discovered the role of the Minister in the whole proceeding. Mr. Francis in Russia was personally courageous, but his equipment for estimating Russian affairs just about touched zero. From the Near East we have had some ex post facto memoirs—but how many of the sensational revelations were revealed when they happened?

The truth is that our embassies were either telegraph and passport stations or they were completely engulfed in the officialism of the capital where they happened to be. They retailed some of the gossip of the capital; they reported what the bureaucracies in the Foreign Offices wanted to have reported. As independent sources of information they did not, with one or two exceptions, exist. The proof of this assertion is that the President did not use them. It never occurred to him to use his diplomatic service where matters of high policy were concerned. It never occurred to him to inform his diplomatic service as to what he was about. Mr. Creel's agent might know, or pretend to know; some other agent sent from Washington might know some scrap of policy, but the very last place to discover American policy was an American Embassy.

From these uninformed and misinformed outposts there trickled back to Washington a series of dispatches which were duly embalmed in the State Department archives. That department was unorganized to receive information, had it been available. If any one doubts this, let him examine the receiving apparatus of the State Department for Western Europe, the Central Powers, Russia and the Near East. How many men were detailed to this vast work? What was their equipment, and who were they? Two of them, I think, got to the Peace Conference, and one of these did administrative work when he got there. Our "Russian experts" in Washington, our "Near Eastern experts" weren't even taken to Paris when the fate of Russia and the Near East was to be decided. Yet they were supposed, during the war, to sift the intelligence concerning these areas of the world for the enlightenment of the Department of State.

Whatever impulse there may have been in Europe to send home information during the war soon perished with the discovery that there was nobody in the State Department who was interested in it. To read French and German was quite an accomplishment in that Department. As for Italian, Russian, Polish, Hungarian or any of the lesser languages, there were only hired translators, not, as in the British Foreign Office, men of lifelong personal acquaintance with these regions. The State Department was incredibly unprepared and incredibly complacent about it. Until rather recently the best Balkan map in Mr. Lansing's office antedated the first Balkan war. The "Russian Division" during the critical period of Brest-Litovsk was composed, I think, of two gentlemen and a couple of stenographers. The installation of direct telegraphic wires to the Department is a recent accomplishment.

Extraordinary as it sounds, it is nevertheless true, that American entrance into the war produced no radical change in the Department. We had decided to abandon "isolation" but the State Department remained almost as isolated from Europe as it ever was. No administrative collapse in any department was so complete as the collapse of the State Department. The military establishment was a miracle of efficiency in comparison. Mr. Burleson was really pretty good, because he did deliver letters after a while. Initially unprepared, the Department and the Diplomatic Service were of small interest to the White House. Mr. Wilson acted through other agencies, informed himself from other sources, and acted independently. The Department, divorced from responsibility, lacked all incentive, and so it creaked along out of contact with American diplomacy, a mere instrument of diplomatic formality.

If we are to act at all as a member of the League of Nations, the Department will have to be overhauled from top to bottom. The permanent service cannot be recruited simply from well-to-do young gentlemen with good manners; and the embassies simply cannot be parcelled out any longer to lame ducks, campaign contributors, and incipient movie stars. There was a time perhaps when diplomatic service was a pleasant sojourn abroad. It is that no longer. The whole business needs to be taken out of politics and privilege, and the selections made from men of training and education. In order to make such selection possible some

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means will have to be found for providing the training.

Then somebody with organizing genius needs to be put in charge of the Department to devise a system by which the exceedingly intricate problem of exchanging information between the capitals and Washington and Geneva can be worked out. Important as are some of the reservations the Senate is discussing, this is of infinitely more importance, and the question which the Senate ought to be asking Mr. Wilson is: What plans have you formulated for a diplomatic service capable of undertaking the duties imposed upon it by the covenant? For unless such plans exist, the covenant is either an empty device or a most dangerous one. Without a regeneration of the State Department, the American government is impotent in the League, because its representative will be deaf, dumb and blind.

Impotent for good, he will become, unwittingly, no doubt, powerful for evil. An uninformed man, representing such influence as the United States exercises, is a standing invitation to intrigue. European diplomacy will rush in to fill the vacuum of his mind, as it is an absolute certainty that he will be used for purposes he does not understand. It is inevitable that he should be. He will be entertained with special views, saturated with propaganda, swamped in misinformation. If he cannot check up independently, he is lost, hopelessly lost, because an ignorant man cannot negotiate with a man who has a thousand facts to support his side of the case.

Even if he suspects that he is having his leg pulled, he will be unable to save himself, because standing alone at Geneva, he will find that an irresistible public opinion is being prepared behind him. He will find himself in an ocean of propaganda, and this propaganda will be active in America as well as in Europe. For the American newspapers have practically no independent access to European diplomatic affairs. Between them and the facts is a curtain of censorship, and a whole structure of subsidized news agencies, publicity bureaus and expert manipulators of opinion. Before America can hope to take an American part in Europe, the American press will have, probably with the assistance of the government, to liberate itself from its present state of dependence upon Europe. It is doubtful whether any American editor who has not been abroad and seen the European propaganda machines at work, can realize how shrewdly, how deliberately he is being manipulated for purposes that he would never in the world approve. But he could test the matter if he really talked candidly with the leading American correspondents who have been at Paris and other European centers. They know perfectly well how the thing works, and the best of them are sick at heart about the illusions which the press at home continues to assert.

There is, too, a reverse aspect of the matter. If American opinion is screened from the facts about Europe, Europe is no less screened from the American facts. One of the genuine calamities of our part in the war was the character of American propaganda in Europe. It was run as if an imp had devised it to thwart every purpose Mr. Wilson was supposed to entertain. The general tone of it was one of unmitigated brag accompanied by unmitigated gullibility. Europe was told that we would do everything and at the same time that everybody could do so. We were going to win the war for Europe by stupendous magnificence, and by implication Europe was to decide entirely what to do with that victory when won. The outfit which was abroad "selling the war to Europe" (the phrase is not my own) gave shell-shocked Europe to understand that a rich bumpkin had come to town with his pockets bulging and no desire except to please. One would never have dreamed from these "personal representatives of the President" who were all over the place that America had purposes and interests and ideas and reservations together with its whole-hearted determination to win the war. To be sure none of these things had appeared on the surface at home, because whenever they did appear Mr. Burleson or the Department of Justice stepped on them. But they were there, and in a mutilated way they have emerged in the Senate. No wonder "Europe" is distressed at the delay and at the discovery that America has something which might be called a mind of its own. Europeans were never told that by our diplomats or by our press agents abroad.

Attention to the sort of detail instanced above is the indispensable condition of any useful participation in the League. Failure to attend to it is among the chief causes of the failure at Paris. I call it a failure because I am convinced that from the Saar to Shantung, the decisions at Paris create situations that mean wars, revolutions, and social degeneration. I believe that with practically no important exceptions these decisions were taken against the judgment of our delegates, and while I too hope that the League can revise these arrangements into a peace, it would be great folly to suppose that a delegate at Geneva will be more successful than Mr. Wilson was. He will be peculiarly isolated, and without adequate powers. The country meantime will turn practically its whole attention to the domestic crisis which has been precipitated in part at least by the fact that the only real authority in the government—the President—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been distracted to Europe. Surely it is clear that what the President could not do on the ground with an undivided mind, he cannot do from Washington in the intervals of a struggle with Congress and an attempt to solve the complex issue of prices and wages. Unless there is a diplomatic service, our government cannot act at all in the League.

And so, whether our faith in the League is much or little, provided we have any faith at all, our first duty is to take immediately steps toward creating from its foundation a Department of State in place of the discarded and incompetent affair which now bears the name.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

Schools

IT is a comforting reflection, as we look over our schools, that *any* system of education, if pursued long enough, will educate. The English private schools, like Eton and Rugby, which based their whole system of training on the process of turning English into Greek or Latin prosodical forms, would seem to have discovered the ultimate limit of futility. It is hard to conceive what more useless occupation could be found for the ordinary boy than phrasing banalities in abnormal constructions in a dead language. Making bricks without straw at least developed ingenuity, but writing Latin verses had not even that merit. And yet the English private schools turned out many well-educated boys, and the statesmen and poets who were once in attendance at Oxford or Cambridge are an innumerable host, (from John Milton to Rupert Brooke, and from Ascham to Asquith). Our own "finishing schools" for girls, one would swear, presented the apotheosis of inanity. A friend of mine went down to look over a Virginia institution the other day; she had four hours there; and they spent half an hour of it showing her the best view of the grounds, and half an hour more in exhibiting the blooded stallion, which they told her was the pride of the place. And yet what alert-minded, generous, and occasionally even thoughtful young persons one finds among their "finished" products! Anything which is stuck to, which has to be done well or understood clearly to get approval, whether it be music or cooking or philosophy, is educative.

It is necessary of course to distinguish between practical education and theoretical education. Practical education is the sort which enables its recipient to make money or to manage men. Theoretical education is the education which enables a man to comprehend abstract propositions. One deals principally with material facts, the other with ideas. There is no war between them; they are correlating parts of a unit; but the business man, who is constantly undergoing practical education, does not believe this. He, and the ordinary lawyer, too, who is only a business man with a legal training, objects to ideas as such. He regards them as at best a waste of time, and at worst as misleading. One of the striking facts in the recent war was the businessman's conviction that most of the mismanagement and inefficiency of the administration could have been foreseen by anyone who knew that President Wilson had been a college professor and a student of history—had been, in other words, interested in ideas. The business man will point out to you that not only is Wilson himself impractical, but that he has filled Washington with equally impractical fellows. The college professor, he will tell you, is the curse of the country today; but for his baleful influence we should have won the war a year earlier. Take the labor situation, and the reports of the Mediation Commission, headed by a Professor, Felix Frankfurter. Those reports filled the business man with horror. Put a strong man in charge of labor; let him order men to do thus and so. And if they refuse? Well, just there the imagination of the business man halts. He contents himself with replying that we cannot be worse off than we are. Is he right? Perhaps. Is he wrong? Perhaps. He doesn't know. He has never studied the general situation. He knows only that his own small group of employees rolls on somehow, and is replenished somehow, and he believes that what he does on a small scale somebody else can do on a big scale.

Well, it is theorists who educate our children at school, and almost every bit of school education our children get, therefore, is opposed in spirit to what businessmen think education ought to be. I wish to point out that the whole effort of the schools is to make your children not certain, but uncertain; questioners, not acceptors; not dogmatic, but open to argument and experimentation. Many boys and some girls escape from college, many more of course from preparatory schools, untouched by the school's point of view, their belief in the domination of the practical unscratched; but just in so far as they are touched by it they are spoiled, according to the businessman's idea. Since this is true, I have never been able to understand why the schools are not changed.

As a teacher I must grant then that education in a practical sense the schools are not, at least in intention. By managing the school newspaper or the school football team a boy may learn something practical, but he will get no credit for it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toward his graduation. In his classes he will have to theorize, and to listen to theories, all day and every day; and the further he goes the less his instructors will be interested in seeing that he gets facts, except as a basis upon which he may theorize more confidently. As the well-known Mr. Sunday is reported to have said, Mr. Sunday whom I should regard as the apotheosis of the businessman in religion, as Mr. Sunday may or may not have said in his piquant theological fashion, colleges in particular are factories for the production of God damn dirty little skeptics.

As a parent, I find many things about the schools ridiculous. A niece of mine studied American history in the grades, and reached practically the same point in the same textbook for three successive years. She knew all about the American Revolution, but officially she had never been made aware of the Rebellion. George Washington and she were intimate, but Lincoln she had never heard of, except at home. My own daughter has now completed the text books on arithmetic assigned to the grades. She brought me a problem a while ago, for inspection. Here it is: In a room 18½ feet long, 13¾ feet wide, 9 feet high, how many rolls of wall paper 2½ feet wide and thirty feet long will be needed? This is an advanced, scientific, vocational arithmetic. If I were bringing up my daughter to be a paper-hanger, I could see its value. But the next problem was: How large a bowl will be needed for six goldfish, assuming that each fish needs three quarts of water, that the bowl is circular, and that it is to be filled to two-thirds of its capacity? It seems to me hardly likely that as a paper-hanger she would be interested in the domestic science of the goldfish. I know that a goldfish has no real privacy; but even so such a problem seems a needless intrusion.

Of course, the great problem in our schools is to get decent teaching. We cannot get the best results if we can pay salaries which are sufficient only for fourth or tenth-rate intelligences. The plumber who clears out our waste-pipes is far better paid than the woman who directs our child's activities of mind, because a clogged pipe is an immediate annoyance, and a stupidly-taught child is only a potential evil. The wonder is that the teachers are as efficient as they are. With forty-five restless, uncivilized, immature personalities nagging at her five mortal hours a day, many a teacher in our public schools keeps her head, her temper, and her humanity, though knowing that she will receive less than a dollar an hour for her services in the school room alone, without counting her innumerable hours of duty outside; less, that is to say, than ten cents per pupil per day. For nine cents a day we expect her to assume for our children all the responsibilities, including real sympathetic appreciation, which we light-heartedly shake off. And the wonder is, as I say, that for nine cents a day she does assume them. Her reward is, I am told, in her social prestige; she has a higher social standing than the plumber. I knew a teacher of English some years ago at a socially prestigious western academy, who resigned his job and went to work in the stock yards, because, as he told me afterwards, he didn't like to be regarded as socially an alien. The explanation of the school teacher's sacrifice is simply habit. As Stevenson says, "the desire of good is at her heels, the implacable hunter"; she gets into a rut of decency and self-immolation; she has brought her offerings of zeal so many times to the altar that she can breathe the heavy perfume of her sacrifice without an effort now.

JAMES WEBER LINN.

The Critic and the Criticized

IT is the boast of more than one proud author, popular or unpopular, that he never reads any criticism of his own work. He knows from his wife or his sorrowing friends that such criticism exists. Sometimes in hurrying through the newspaper he catches sight of his unforgettable name. Inadvertently he may read on, learning the drift of the comment before he stops himself. But his rule is rigid. He never reads what the critics say about him.

Before an author comes to this admirable self-denial he has usually had some experience of the ill-nature and caprice of critics. Probably he started out in the friendliest spirit. He said to himself, Of course I don't profess to *like* criticism. Nobody likes to be criticized. But I hope I am big enough to stand any criticism that is fair and just. No man can grow who is not willing to be criticized, but so long as criticism is helpful that's all a man has a right to ask. Is it meant to be helpful? If so, shoot.

After some experience of helpful criticism, it will often occur to the sensitive author that he is not being completely understood. A man's ego should certainly not stand in the way of criticism, but hasn't a man a right to his own style and his own personality? What is the use of criticism that is based on the critic's dislike of the author's personality? The critic who has a grudge against an author simply because he thinks and feels in a certain way is scarcely likely to be helpful. The author and the critic are not on common ground. And the case is not improved by the very evident intrusion of the critic's prejudices and limitations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is perfectly obvious that a man with a bias will see in a book just what he wants to see. If he is a reactionary, he will bolster up his own case. If he is a Bolshevik he will unfailingly bolshevize. So what is the use of reading criticism? The critic merely holds the mirror up to his own nature, when he is not content to reproduce the publisher's prepared review.

The author goes on wondering, "What does he say about me?" But the disappointments are too many. Once in a blue moon the critic "understands" the author. He manages, that is to say, to do absolutely the right thing by the author's ego. He strokes it hard and strokes it the right way. After that he points out one or two of the things that are handicapping the author's creative force, and he shows how easily such handicaps can be removed. This is the helpful, appreciative, perceptive critic. But for one of his kind there are twenty bristling young egoists who want figs to grow on thistles and cabbages to turn into roses, and who blame the epic for not giving them a lyric thrill. These critics, the smart-alecks, have no real interest in the author. They are only interested in themselves. And so, having tackled them in a glow of expectation that has always died into sulky gloom, the author quits reading criticism and satisfies his natural curiosity about himself by calling up the publisher and inquiring after sales.

For my own part, I deprecate this behavior without being able to point to much better models. Critics are of course superior to most authors, yet I do not know many critics who like to be criticized. It does not matter whether they are thin-skinned literary critics or the hippopotami of sociology. They don't like it, much. Some meet criticism with a sweet resourcefulness. They choke down various emotions and become oh so gently receptive. Others stiffen perceptibly, sometimes into a cautious diplomacy and sometimes into a pontifical dignity that makes criticism nothing less than a personal affront. And then there is the way of the combative man who interprets the least criticism as a challenge to a fight. The rare man even in so-called intellectual circles is the man who takes criticism on its merits and thinks it natural that he should not only criticize but be criticized.

The pontifical man is not necessarily secure in his ego. His frigid reception of criticism corresponds to something like a secret terror of it. His air of dignity is really an air of offended dignity, he hates being called on to defend himself in anything like a rough-and-tumble fight. He resents having his slow, careful processes hustled and harried in the duel of dispute.

To hand down judgments, often severe judgments, is part of the pontifical character. But the business of meeting severe judgments is not so palatable. As most men grow older and more padded in their armchair-criticism, they feel that they become entitled to immunity. The Elder Statesmen are notorious. The more dogmatic they are, the more they try to browbeat their critics. They see criticism as the critic's fundamental inability to appreciate their position.

It is the untutored ego, of course, that leaps out against criticism in every case. That is why there is so little agreeable disputing about taste. It does not mean that there can be no profitable disputing about taste on a common ground of culture; it simply means that we are all so egotistic, any challenge issued against our taste can hardly help seeming ungracious and disagreeable. In most cases, unfortunately, the challenge may actually be ungracious and disagreeable. It may bring into dispute not the tastes that are entertained but the folly or fatuity of the person who entertains them.

Should criticism ever be directed against the folly and fatuity of an author? Perhaps never. No man can be asked to take the criticism, or profit by the criticism, that he is a congenital idiot. It is sufficient to demonstrate that his work is the product of congenital idiocy, and leave the inference to the author's associates and friends. A man has a right to his personality, even if it be constitutionally inferior, and it is never "helpful" to ask him to put it off. A little gentle pressure in that direction is not necessarily cruel. It may even be a public service. But the art of criticism should discriminate between damning a man and damning his work.

If you are going to be criticized how take it? The best preparation for it is to establish good relations with your own ego first. If you interpose your ego between your work and the critic you cannot help being insulted and injured. The mere fact that you are being subjected to criticism is almost an injury in itself. You must get to the point where you realize the impregnability of your own admirable character. Then the bumblings of the critic cannot do less than amuse you and may possibly be of use. He is not so sweet a partisan as yourself, yet he started out rather indifferent to you, and the mere fact that he is willing to criticize you is a proof that he has overcome the initial inhumanity of the human race. This alone should help, but more than that you have the advantage of knowing he is an amateur on that topic where you are most expert—namely, yourself. Be kind to him. Perhaps if you are sufficiently kind he may learn that the beginning of the entente between you is that he should always start out by appeasing your ego.

FRANCIS HACKETT.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Smuts: Statesman

GENERAL SMUTS issued the following farewell message on the eve of his departure from England for South Africa:

From the bottom of my heart I wish to thank the British people, who have not hesitated to honour and trust one who was once their enemy. My own case is a striking instance of how the enemy of today may be the friend and comrade of tomorrow, and must in these difficult days make all of us realize how important it is to practise moderation and restraint in the expression of our feelings toward those who were yesterday our bitter enemies. This brings me to certain observations about the present situation which I consider it advisable to make. Certain things have to be said today, though I find great and general unwillingness to say them. The position I have occupied in this country, and the fact that under very difficult circumstances and in spite of many heart-searchings, both for myself and my people, I have taken a most active part against the Germans from the first to the last day of the late war, give me the right to say them without giving offense to anybody.

The protest which I issued on signing the Peace Treaty has called forth a vast correspondence which shows a widespread agreement with the views I hold on that document, as well as on the international situation generally. Deep as my disappointment was with many important features of the treaty, I did not protest in bitterness or from any desire to criticize.

The past is done and must be accepted as a fact; the future is before us to make or mar. And I spoke with an eye to the future, with a desire to create the right spirit wherewith to confront the difficult situation before us.

In spite of the apparent failure of the Peace Conference to bring about the real and lasting appeasement of the nations to which we had been looking forward, our faith in our great ideals should be kept untarnished. The sting of bitterness should be taken out of the great disillusion which is overtaking the peoples. Instead of sitting down in despair as reactionaries or anarchists we should continue to march forward with firm step as those who have the great hope.

The fundamental significance of the war has been the victory of the spirit, of the moral over the material factors of life. Germany had entered upon a vast venture in materialism, and had constructed the most tremendous mechanical apparatus of victory which the world had ever seen. But the neglected moral factors, the public opinion of mankind, the outraged conscience of the nations in the end avenged themselves and inflicted the most signal defeat on the forces of scientific materialism.

Spirit has triumphed, the apparently weak moral elements which constitute the motive forces of human progress have been vindicated in a way which will make this war one of the most significant landmarks in human history. The victory has been not to the strong, but to the finer, more generous elements in human nature. The great ideals of progress have won through; that is the real and abiding significance of this war and its tremendous conclusion.

If that is so, then this war should leave no lasting bitterness behind it in the minds of the peoples. The baser elements of human nature have been defeated in the enemy: they should not reestablish themselves in the victors. The tremendous spiritual *élan,* the explanation of the ideal which carried us through the great struggle, should not now make way for barren hatreds, abject fears, base greeds.

Now more than ever should the banner of the spirit be borne aloft by all of us, as at once the symbol and secret of victory. In hoc signo vinces. The ethical human factors have vindicated themselves in a way which is little short of miraculous. It is, therefore, most right and proper that we should practice the great Christian qualities of mercy, pity, and forgiveness, which constitute the very essence and differentia of our religion.

If all this is true and admitted, the political application of international affairs follows quite obviously. There must be a real peace between the nations. The word reconciliation has to be writ large on our skies. Our hearts have to be emptied of all bitterness and hatred, and the memories of war atrocities should not harden our hearts against the revival of a new international life. A new life, a new spirit is imperatively necessary if Europe is not to fall backward and lag behind other continents in the great march of humanity.

Her lot is indeed pitiable beyond words. The Continent which is the motherland of our civilization lies in ruins, exhausted by the most terrible struggle in history, with its peoples broken, starving, despairing, from sheer nervous exhaustion mechanically struggling forward along the paths of anarchy and war, and seeing only red through the blinding mist of tears and fears—almost a mad Continent, more fit for Bedlam than for the tremendous task of reconstruction that lies before it.

It is the most awful spectacle in history and no man with any heart or regard for human destiny can contemplate it without the deepest emotion.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No, it is not a case for hatred or bitterness, but for all-embracing pity, for extending the helping hand to late friend and foe alike, and for a mission of rescue work such as the world has never seen. Europe is and will, for this generation, be the greatest mission field in which the energies of the great-hearted peoples of this country and America could be spent. And the gospel will be that original one of "goodwill among men," of human comradeship beyond the limits of nations, of fellow-feeling and common service in great human causes.

All this applies to Europe generally, but I wish to add a word in reference to Germany and Russia, in particular, as the situation is too grave to permit of any shrinking from the frankest expression of opinion.

The brutal fact is that Great Britain is a very small island on the fringe of the Continent, and that on that Continent the 70 odd million Germans represent the most important and formidable national factor. You cannot have a stable Europe without a stable, settled Germany, and you cannot have a stable, settled, prosperous Great Britain while Europe is weltering in confusion and unsettlement next door.

In our policy of European settlement the appeasement of Germany, therefore, becomes one of cardinal importance. We have today in Germany a moderate republic, which, in my opinion, deserves encouragement and support from this country. It has done its best to prevent anarchy on the one hand and military reaction on the other, and has done so with more success than I, for one, expected.

Ebert's republic has been for months standing in the breach fighting the battle of European order against the growing forces of anarchy. The great issue will probably be decided in Germany for good and all. And Ebert deserves our backing and encouragement. Do not let us deal with Ebert as we dealt with Kerensky and Karolyi—with results beyond recall today.

Russia is an even more obscure and difficult problem than Germany, and one on which no dogmatic opinion would be justified. But from all the information which has come into my possession, I am seriously doubtful about the sort of policy which we seem to be pursuing there. Russia can only be saved internally by Russians themselves, working on Russian methods and ideas. She is a case of national pathology, of a people with a sick soul, and only Russian ideas could work a cure. Our military forces, our lavish contributions of tanks, and other war material may temporarily bolster up the one side, but the real magnitude of the problem is quite beyond such expedients.

Leave Russia alone, remove the blockade, adopt a policy of friendly neutrality and Gallio-like impartiality to all factions.

It may well be that the only ultimate hope for Russia is a sobered, purified, Soviet system, and that may be far better than the Tsarism to which our present policy seems inevitably tending. If we have to appear on the Russian scene at all, let it be as impartial, benevolent friends and helpers and not as military or political partisans. Be patient with sick Russia, give her time and sympathy, and await the results of her convalescence.

We have a good deal to set in order in our own house. The Dominions have been well launched on their great career; their status of complete nationhood has now received international recognition, and as members of the Britannic League they will henceforth go forward on terms of equal brotherhood with the other nations on the great paths of the world. The successful launching of her former colonies among the nations of the world, while they remain members of an inner Britannic circle, will ever rank as one of the most outstanding achievements of British political genius. Forms and formulas may still have to be readjusted, but the real work is done.

There still remains the equally important task of properly locating the great dependencies like India and Egypt in the free democratic British league. Recent severe troubles in both dependencies mentioned serve to remind us that no time must be lost in boldly grappling with this problem. It is a task to be approached with an open mind and with the fixed determination here, too, to realize those principles of freedom and self-government without which this Empire cannot continue to exist in the new time.

The Dominion solution will obviously not apply, but it may be found possible to reconcile native self-government with a system of expert advice and assistance which will replace the dead hand of bureaucratic dominion by the lighter, but no less effective, touch of the friendly hand. The problem, however difficult, is capable of a practical solution, and precedents for dealing with it are not entirely wanting.

But the most pressing of all constitutional problems in the Empire is the Irish question. It has become a chronic wound, the septic effects of which are spreading to our whole system, and, through its influence on America, it is now beginning to poison our most vital foreign relations.

Unless the Irish question is settled on the great principles which form the basis of this Empire, this Empire must cease to exist. The fact that Irishmen cannot be made to agree may have been a good reason for not forcing on a solution dur-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the war, but now, after peace, the question should be boldly grappled with. Our statesmen have just come back from Paris, where they have dealt with racial problems like that of Ireland and in every way as difficult as the Irish problem. They may not shrink from applying to Ireland the same medicine that they have applied to Bohemia and many another part of Europe.

And this brings me to say, finally, a word on questions of a more domestic character in this country. There are difficult days ahead for this country, and this nation will be tested as never before in the searching times that are coming. The greatest hurricane in history is raging over the world, and it is idle to expect that we shall be able to shelter ourselves from its effects. Vast changes are coming and are already beginning to loom into sight.

There is no formula of patent medicine that will see us through this crisis. What matters is the spirit in which we approach the situation facing us. And the spirit I am pleading for is that of openness of mind and willingness to learn and to try new methods—a spirit of humility in face of unexemplified difficulties and a spirit of humanity and generosity in all relations of life, and a spirit of human fellowship and comradeship to the service of the great saving ideals of humanity.

In a word, I see salvation for us and the world only in a more human spirit and outlook all round. What is the good of all the wealth and comfort and glamour of the Victorian Age when the next two decades bring us to the graves of ten million young men slain because of the base passions of greed and domination which lurked below the smiling surface of that age? The game is not worth the candle, and we should rather welcome the new and difficult times on which we are now entering.

For, doubt it not that we are at the beginning of a new century. The old world is dying around us; let it also die in us. Once more in the history of the human race we hear the great creative Spirit utter those tremendous words, "Behold, I make all things new." Old ideas of wealth, of property, of class and social relations, of international relations of moral and spiritual values are rapidly changing. The old political formulas sound hollow, the old landmarks by which we used to steer are disappearing beneath a great flood. The furnace through which we have passed has melted the hard crust of our life, and the old fixities and certainties are fluid once more.

Let us work for a better, happier world to arise from this fluid mass. Let us move forward with courage and in faith and let us not fall back into the hopeless enmities, the sterile and blasting bitterness of the past. Among the nations of the world this great country has in the past enjoyed the most splendid reputation for political wisdom, generosity, and magnanimity. Let this mighty Empire, in this great hour of victory and at the zenith of its power win a great moral victory, so that the ideals which have shaped the destiny of our great commonwealth of nations may become the common heritage of the League of Nations and of Europe.

Only then will this war not have been fought in vain, and the future garner the far-off interest of our tears.

The Value of Japanese Promises

JAPANESE statesmen and Japanese propagandists have often stated during the past six months that Japan always keeps her promises. By the repetition of this assertion many who know little of Far Eastern politics have been deceived and many who know more of Far Eastern politics have been unspeakably wearied. I therefore propose briefly to test whether Japan always keeps her promises. To make this test absolutely fair, I shall admit as testimony only official statements signed by the leaders of the Japanese government or their authorized agents. They alone shall testify as to Japan's promises and as to her performances. Such a test will not, in a sense, be quite fair, for no nation ever confesses all its sins in public. But at least it will be fair to the Japanese.

Let us, then, take up some of these promises under three heads—Korea; the "Open Door" and the independence and territorial integrity of China; and Kiaochau (the port of Shantung).

First, Korea. On August 26, 1894, there was signed a treaty of alliance between Japan and Korea in which Article 1 states that "the object of the alliance is to maintain the independence of Korea on a firm footing and . . . ." On April 25, 1898, Japan and Russia signed an agreement. Article 1 says, "The (two governments) recognize definitely the sovereignty and entire independence of Korea and pledge themselves mutually to abstain from all direct interference in the internal affairs of that country." Four years later (January 30, 1902) the first treaty of alliance between Great Britain and Japan was signed. Article 1 affirms that "The High Contracting Parties, having mutually recognized the independence of China and of Korea, declare themselves entirely uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies in either country." Eight years later Japan completely annexed Korea.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For this final step the following agreements slowly paved the way. On February 23, 1904, a protocol signed by Japan and Korea provided (Art. 1) that "the Imperial Government of Korea shall place full confidence in the Imperial Government of Japan in regard to improvements in administration." But still (Art. 3) Japan reasserted that "the Imperial Government of Japan definitely guarantees the independence and territorial integrity of the Korean empire." Despite this guarantee, however, the second treaty of alliance between Great Britain and Japan (August 12, 1905) included this provision: "Japan possessing paramount political, military and economic interests in Korea, Great Britain recognizes the right of Japan to take such measures . . . . in Korea . . . . as she may deem proper . . . . " On November 17, 1905, Korea agreed, in a convention signed with Japan, that (Art. 1) "the Government of Japan . . . . will hereafter have control and direction of the external relations and affairs of Korea . . . . " Another convention between the two countries (signed on July 24, 1907) made the further provision that (Art. 1) "In all matters relating to the reform of Korean administration the Korean government shall receive instructions and guidance from the (Japanese) Resident-General" and that (Art. 5) "the Korean government shall appoint to be officials of Korea any Japanese subjects recommended by the Resident-General." In 1908 Prince Ito (the Resident-General) declared publicly that Japan had no intention of annexing Korea. Finally, on August 22, 1910, Japan formally declared Korea annexed to the dominions of his Imperial Majesty the Japanese Emperor. That is the way Japan kept her promises with regard to Korea.

Let us next take up Japan's promises with regard to the "Open Door" (or equal opportunity in China for the commerce and industry of all nations) and the independence and territorial integrity of China. To go back no further than 1905, Japan has signed six public documents guaranteeing the "Open Door" and the independence and integrity of China. These are as follows:

1. Second Treaty of Alliance with Great Britain. August 12, 1905.

Preamble: "The Governments of Great Britain and Japan . . . have agreed upon the following articles, which have for their object: . . . b.) the preservation of the common interest of all Powers in China by insuring the independence and integrity of the Chinese Empire and the principle of equal opportunities for the commerce and industry of all nations in China."

2. Franco-Japanese Arrangement. June 10, 1907.

"The Governments of Japan and France, being agreed to respect the independence and integrity of China, as well as the principle of equal treatment in that country for the commerce of subjects or citizens of all nations, . . . &c."

3. Russo-Japanese Convention. July 30, 1907.

Article 2. "The two High Contracting Parties recognize the independence and the territorial integrity of the Empire of China and the principle of equal opportunity in whatever concerns the commerce and industry of all nations in that empire . . . "

4. The "Root-Takahira Agreement"—an understanding between the United States and Japan. November 30, 1908.

Paragraph 2. "The policy of both governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to . . . the defence of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China. . . . " Paragraph 4. "They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire."

5. The Third Treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Japan (July 13, 1911) states as one object of the alliance, "the preservation of the common interests of all the Powers in China by insuring the independence and integrity of the Chinese Empire and the principle of equal opportunities for the commerce and industry of all nations in China."

6. The "Lansing-Ishii Agreement" — the latest understanding between the United States and Japan. November 2, 1917.

. . . "The governments of the United States and Japan deny that they have any purpose to infringe in any way the independence or territorial integrity of China, and they declare furthermore that they always adhere to the principle of the so-called 'Open Door' or equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China. Moreover, they mutually declare that they are opposed to the acquisition by any government of any special rights or privileges that would affect the independence or territorial integrity of China or that would deny to the subjects or citizens of any country the full enjoyment of equal opportunity in the commerce and industry of China."

In these documents we see explicit promises by Japan to four leading Powers, pledges given during a period of twelve years. We turn now to see how these have been kept, citing first the lesser and then the greater facts.

By way of maintaining equal opportunity and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rejecting all special privilege, Japan signed an agreement with China on December 22, 1905, by which China agreed (Article 8) . . . "that all materials required for the railways in South Manchuria shall be exempt from all duties, taxes, and likin. (The Japanese had just received from Russia the South Manchurian Railway.) Secret protocols added to this same agreement further provided that (No. 3) "The Chinese Government engage, for the purpose of protecting the interests of the South Manchurian Railway, not to construct, prior to the recovery by them of the said railway (a date now fixed at 2002 A.D.) any main line in the neighborhood of and parallel to that railway, or any branch line which might be prejudicial to the interests of the above-mentioned railway." No. 8 provided that "the regulations respecting the places to be opened in Manchuria shall be made by China herself, but the Japanese minister at Peking must be previously consulted regarding the matter."

These requirements of Japan, denying equality to all nations in Manchuria and limiting the independence of China, were the basis for her protests of January 31, 1910. The protests were directed against a plan approved by the United States, Great Britain, and China by which American and British corporations were to construct a railway from Chin-chou to Aigun—a road running partly in Mongolia, partly in Manchuria, and partly in China proper. Because Japan considered this project an infringement of her special rights, her minister at Peking wrote to the Chinese Foreign office as follows: . . . "My government is now considering it (the Chin-chou-Aigun railway) and cannot hastily formulate its demands. . . . Before the Chinese government determines anything, the consent of my government must first be obtained. If the position of my country is ignored, and a decision made without referring the matter to my government, it will be hard to estimate the seriousness of the trouble that may be caused in the relations of the two countries." Russia supported the objections here voiced, and the railway project was weakly abandoned.

Such evidence, however, of Japan's readiness to relax her solemn obligations seems harmless compared with what was to follow. On January 18, 1915, Japan presented to China the famous "Twenty-one Demands." To secure secrecy the Japanese minister presented them directly to President Yuan, requiring of him secrecy and speed in his reply. But the truth could not be hid, and rumors were soon afloat. At first Japan denied the existence of any of the demands, then denied the existence of some of them, and finally confessed to the existence of all of them. Why she could not afford to be frank appears clearly enough when the demands are examined.

In the first group of these articles China concedes in advance any arrangements that Japan might in future make with Germany regarding the possession of Kiaochau and other rights in the province of Shantung. The way was thus paved for Japan's later victory at the Peace Conference. In the second group of articles Japan demands that China recognize Japan's special privileges in Manchuria, privileges accorded to no other nation. For example, Article 3 reads, "Japanese subjects shall be free to reside and travel in South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia and to engage in business and manufacture of any kind whatsoever." Article 4. "The Chinese Government agrees to grant to Japanese subjects the right of opening the mines in South Manchuria and Eastern Mongolia. . . ." Article 6. "If the Chinese Government employs political, financial, or military advisers or instructors in South Manchuria or Eastern Mongolia, the Japanese government shall first be consulted." That is how Japan kept her promise to maintain the "Open Door" and the independence of China in Manchuria.

In Group IV, furthermore, "The Chinese Government engages not to cede or lease to any *third* power any harbor or bay or island along the coast of China." Even this group, however, did not offer the worst instance of special privilege or infringement of China's sovereignty. The articles in Group V go further. Article I. "The Chinese Central Government shall employ influential Japanese as advisers in political, financial, and military affairs." Article 3. ". . . the police departments of important places (in China) shall be jointly administered by Japanese and Chinese, or the police department of these places shall employ numerous Japanese. . . ." Article 4. "China shall purchase from Japan a fixed amount of munitions of war (say 50% or more of what is needed by the Chinese government) or there shall be established in China a Sino-Japanese jointly worked arsenal. Japanese technical experts are to be employed and Japanese material to be purchased." Article 6. "If China needs foreign capital to work mines, build railways, and construct harbor-works (including dock-yards) in the Province of Fukien, Japan shall be first consulted."

In making these demands Japan broke at least six solemn public promises. That she had forgotten neither the spirit nor the letter of these promises and that she was ready to break one more, is a fact confirmed by a statement issued on May 6, 1915, by Secretary Bryan: "At the beginning of negotiations the Japanese government confidentially informed this government of the matters

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which were under discussion and accompanied the information by the assurance that Japan had no intention of interfering with either the political independence or territorial integrity of China, and that nothing that she proposed would discriminate against other powers having treaties with China or interfere with the "Open Door" policy to which all the leading nations are committed."

What are we to think of the pledged word of a nation which could vouch for such assurances at a time when its government was attempting to wrest from China the control of her own police power, her own armament and her own territory? Through just such stages did Korea slowly succumb, that same Korea whose "independence" was once so firmly guaranteed by Japan. This fact was clear to China and to all the world; and indignant public opinion in both China, England, and America prevented China's signing the articles under Groups IV and V. This eleventh hour escape, however, has no bearing on Japan's capacity to keep promises. That capacity reached a rating of zero at the moment when the "Twenty-one Demands" were secretly and urgently presented. Even to this harsh conclusion we may call for Japanese witnesses. Mr. Kawakami, the leading Japanese propagandist in this country, speaks (in his book Japan in World Politics) of "the unfortunate Japanese diplomacy of the past few years (1915-1917)," and heads his chapter on the "Twenty-one Demands": Japanese Blunders in China. Of course "blunders" we should call too mild a word for dishonor; but Prof. Hayashi of Keio University in Japan (quoted by Prof. Hornbeck of Wisconsin in his Contemporary Politics in the Far East) was willing to put it far more strongly. He resigned from his party in the Diet with the statement, "Why were such abominable demands in the first place framed by the cabinet? . . . It is absolutely an insult to our neighbor's sovereignty. Those desires, if accepted, were that China would consent to be a protectorate of Japan."

Finally, let us turn to the question of Kaiochau and the rights in Shantung Province. On March 6, 1898, China leased to Germany for ninety-nine years the port and bay of Kiaochau, with territory surrounding it, and extensive rights for constructing and operating railways in the interior of the Province of Shantung. On August 15, 1914, Japan issued an ultimatum to Germany giving her one week in which to consent "to deliver on a date not later than September 15 to the Imperial Japanese authorities, without condition or compensation, the entire leased territory of Kiaochau, with a view to the eventual restoration of the same to China." On the same day Count Okuma, the Japanese premier, sent the following telegram to the East and West Bureau in New York for publication in the American press: ". . . Japan has no territorial ambition, and hopes to stand as the protector of peace in the Orient." Nine days later Okuma sent another cable, this time to the New York "Independent." The message closed with these words: "As Premier of Japan, I have stated and now again state to the people of America and of the world that Japan has no ulterior motive, no desire to secure more territory, no thought of depriving China or other peoples of anything which they now possess. My government and my people have given their word and their pledge, which will be as honorably kept as Japan always keeps promises."

The next step was a series of three statements made by Baron Kato, of the Japanese cabinet, to the Japanese Diet in December, 1914. Kato said, "The question regarding the future of Kiaochau is at present unanswerable. Japan has never committed herself to any foreign Power on this point. The purpose of the ultimatum to Germany was to take Kiaochau from Germany and so to restore peace in the Orient. Restitution after a campaign was not thought of and was not referred to in the ultimatum." Again, Japan takes the same attitude in her ultimatum to China in regard to the "Twenty-one Demands" mentioned above, under date of May 7, 1915. In this document it is stated that "from the commercial and military points of view Kiaochau is an important place, in the acquisition of which the Japanese Empire sacrificed much blood and money, and after the acquisition, the Empire incurs no obligation to restore it to China. . . . China is fully aware that the unconditional restoration of Kiaochau . . . can never be tolerated by Japan." The latest word on the subject is written in the Treaty of Versailles. "Germany renounces, in favor of Japan, all her rights, titles, and privileges—particularly those concerning the territory of Kiaochau, railways, mines, and submarine cables—which she acquired in virtue of the treaty concluded by her with China on March 6, 1898, and of all other arrangements relative to the province of Shantung."

Since the facts in this brief summary are all vouched for by Japan, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Japan seldom, if ever, keeps important international promises. In telling America so frequently that she does keep her promises, she is relying not on historical facts, but solely on our national ignorance of Far Eastern politics. The Japanese are a gifted people and a great people, but they suffer from a Prussianized government. In no respect is it more Prussian than in its cynical contempt for international good faith.

JAMES THAYER ADDISON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMMUNICATION

President Wilson and Article X

SIR: Your editorial in the New Republic of September 3d entitled The President With His Fingers Crossed seems to me unfair. Not only is its severe condemnation of the President's interpretation of Article X of the Covenant unjust, but it also gives an erroneous impression of the Covenant. You have, I think, made a mistake which may be due to your keeping your mind on Article X alone instead of considering it along with Articles XII, XIII, XV and XVI.

In substance you find fault with Mr. Wilson because he told the Senate Committee that Article X does not forbid armed intervention, but only forbids the destruction of territorial integrity by armed intervention. You say "Now weak states do not intervene in strong states, so this article leaves the small state as much exposed as ever to intervention by which the great Power imposes its will upon the weak. . . Mr. Wilson's view of Article X is more shamelessly imperialistic than we had supposed it to be, for while it continues to protect the great powers in the League, it deprives the small powers of that meagre protection which the article did seem to offer." You would not, I think, have used this language if you had kept in mind the other provisions of the Covenant which protect weak states against aggression.

It may make the matter clearer if we look at the relevant articles of the Covenant, considering what would happen if a strong power should attack a weak one.

Under Article XII the members of the league agree in case of any dispute likely to lead to a rupture to submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the Council, and not to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the Council.

Article XIII provides for voluntary arbitration of disputes and the members of the league agree that they will carry out in good faith any award that may be rendered and that they will not resort to war against a member of the league which complies therewith.

Article XV provides for inquiry by the Council as to disputes not submitted to arbitration. If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members of the league other than the representatives of the parties to the dispute, the members of the league undertake that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

Article XVI provides that if any member of the league should resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Article XII, XIII, or XV it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the league which undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, etc. The Council is also to make recommendations to the several Governments as to the military or naval forces to be contributed by them.

Let us now suppose that Japan should desire to have a war with China. If Japan attacked China without submitting the dispute either to arbitration or to inquiry by the Council, that would be a resort to war in disregard of her covenant under Article XII, and consequently, under Article XVI, Japan ipso facto would be at war with all the other members of the league. This would happen without any recourse to Article X.

It may be conceived that Japan might submit her dispute with China either to arbitration or to inquiry by the Council. In that case she could not resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report of the Council without disregarding her covenant under Article XII, and so, under Article XVI, bringing all the members of the league into the war against her. The delay and investigation would give public opinion throughout the world opportunity to become informed regarding the merits of the dispute. In case of arbitration both countries under Article XIII, would be bound by the award, and, if China complied with the award, Japan could not make war without bringing in all the members of the league under Article XVI. In case of inquiry under Article XV, if the Council should make a unanimous report and China should comply with the recommendations of the report, Japan, by reason of Article XVI, could not fight China without having all the members of the league against her. In all the foregoing instances you will observe that the Covenant protects the weak power against the strong power without any resort to the provisions of Article X. There remains a possibility either that the Council would fail to agree upon a unanimous report or that China would refuse to comply with the recommendations of the report. In view of the probable consequences, the latter contingency would not be likely to occur. But if either of the contingencies should happen Japan would be free to attack China three months after the report by the Council without interference by the league. Such a war, under the Covenant, would be a permitted war. But the Covenant, by Article X does not allow even such a war to result in an impairment of territorial integrity or a destruction of political independence. It is to such cases as these that Article X applies. It is not a part of the machinery to prevent wars. That machinery is found in Articles XII, XIII, XV and XVI. Thus a member of the league resorting to war in disregard of its covenants under Article X is not under Article XVI deemed to have committed an act of war against the other member of the league and is not subject to the sanctions provided in case of a disregard of the covenants under Articles XII, XIII, or XV.

If the preceding exposition is sound it shows that Article X has far less importance in its practical bearing than has been supposed, and that in the actual working of the League it will seldom be invoked. If it is in the backbone of the league it is so only because it lays down the fundamental principle accepted by all the members that territorial changes are to be effected only by peaceful adjustment and not by armed aggression. I think Mr. Wilson's interpretation is correct and that it does not involve any abandonment of the small powers which are protected by more effective provisions of other articles of the Covenant.

Cornish, New Hampshire. GEORGE RUBLEE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Mexico and the Embargo

SIR: In reading over the admirable paragraphs on the Mexican situation in last week's New Republic, I noticed that one of the most serious inconsistencies of the administration policy toward Mexico had not been touched upon. That is the embargo on shipments of ammunition going to Mexico even when consigned to the Carranza government. Lately a despatch appeared in the press stating that the embargo on ammunition had been put on again, giving the impression that it had been taken off.

According to Dr. Alfredo Caturegle, the financial agent of Mexico at 120 Broadway, the embargo has been on continuously for the past three years, and as an illustration of this a purchase of 10,000,000 cartridges bought and paid for here by the Mexican government has never been moved from New York where it is in storage owing to the repeated refusals on the part of the administration. The administration reason supposedly, is that in case of a war with Mexico this ammunition would be used against our soldiers.

Such a reason is too absurd to consider. If we cannot trust Carranza sufficiently to allow him to buy the necessary equipment to maintain the order we demand he should, we should break off all relations with him whatsoever.

This has been the Mexican government's contention from the first and why the illogical attitude of the administration has not been criticized here in this country is very surprising. I thought perhaps that this might interest you. In reality it is fundamental for as long as this country continues to hold its present semi-hostile and two-faced policy regarding Mexico, no progress can be expected of that country.

Cabrera's reviewing of the arbitration clause in the treaty of Guadeloupe is very hopeful, I think, provided that the administration takes advantage of it. It is time now for the facts to be placed before the American people.

Baltusrol, New Jersey. SCHUYLER N. WARREN, JR.

A Misleading Cry

SIR: The most modern device for fighting the strike is to proclaim it an attempt to establish a Soviet form of government. This serves to conceal the real issues of the controversy and inflames the public mind against the strikers. When all the newspapers print a story, and when no information to the contrary is published, how shall the truth of the facts be known?

This misleading cry of "Soviet government" was given a wide currency in connection with the Lawrence strike, while the press gave no publicity to the findings of competent social investigators like John A. Fitch and the Rev. Charles R. Brown, showing conclusively that the strike was industrial in its causes and in its aims.

Similarly, the Winnipeg strike, proclaimed in the daily press as an attempted "Soviet revolution," is found upon investigation to have grown out of an ordinary struggle on the part of the metal trades over wages, hours, and more especially over the collective bargain. An account of the small beginning of this strike and its later dramatic development is issued by the People's Print (138 W. 13th St., N. Y.) in leaflet form. Whoever will compare this statement with the press reports will see how completely the real issues of the strike were concealed from the public by what is no less than flagrant camouflage.

Forty-four of the Winnipeg strike leaders and dozens of the strikers have been arrested by the authorities on the charge of sedition and conspiracy and are held at exorbitant bail. Arrests, high bail, and expensive legal proceedings are time-honored weapons for cowing the workers and for confusing the public.

The workers of a community exhausted by a strike are in no condition to meet heavy legal expenses. The Winnipeg Defense Committee sends out an appeal for lovers of fair play in the United States to come to their aid.

Contributions may be sent to W. Radis, Labor Temple, Room I, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

These framed-up prosecutions are an attack upon the liberties of us all.

League for Democratic Control.
Room 79, 2 Park Square, Boston, Mass.
Boston, Massachusetts. GERTRUDE L. WINSLOW.

Captain and Private

SIR: In connection with your recent discussion of caste in the army the following incident may be of interest: Some twenty-five or more years ago a young man, a college graduate, enlisted in the regular army. He was assigned to a fort in the Northwest. One of the captains at this fort, a West Point graduate, had been the teacher of the young soldier and he and his wife were fond of him. The friendship was renewed and the private soldier was invited to visit them Sunday afternoons and evenings and dine with them. Knowing the army caste idea they made no publicity of the matter and it is said the window curtains were drawn. Somehow it leaked out that the Captain and his wife were entertaining a private soldier and it stirred considerable feeling. The Colonel's wife made a formal visit and notified the lady that if she continued to extend her hospitality to this private soldier she and her husband would be cut off from the social functions in the fort. The Captain's wife warmly replied to this threat that they regarded the soldier as a friend and that they would entertain him no matter how they were ostracized. Within a year the soldier became a Lieutenant. At the opening of the World War, he became a Colonel and was appointed to a high staff position. He made a splendid record in the war and is now a Major-General in the regular army, and at present is at the head of an important commission. The Captain who entertained the private soldier is also a Major-General in the regular army and has made a fine record.

Chicago, Illinois. DUNCAN C. MILNER.

A French War Novel

SIR: Miss Sergeant in her review of French war literature, Under the Sword of Damocles, fails to mention Paul Bourget's "Le Sens de la Mort." Like several other novels mentioned in the capable article the war is here used only as a background against which to pose the question: Has the individual the right to take his own life? This is thrashed out by the heroine in a French military hospital at the beginning of the war. Marsal, a hospital aide, tells the story giving some remarkable glimpses of hospital life. The book is not available in translation, as far as I know, but is well worth the attention of anyone making a study of the literature of the war.

New York City. NOYES H. REYNOLDS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prophecy and Authority

Prophecy and Authority: a study in the history of the doctrine and interpretation of scripture, by Kemper Fullerton. New York: The Macmillan Co.

THE problem of prophecy and authority has troubled the Christian church from the beginning. It had taken from the Jews a belief in the authority of the Old Testament, and interpreted it largely as prophecy, not law. But immediately difficulties arose. The whole of the Old Testament, it was said, foretold Jesus as the Messiah: but this proposition was the postulate of faith, and to convince others of its truth was not always easy; —especially when the others in question were learned Jews. But the situation was saved by the fact that the true meaning of the prophets was often equally disagreeable to the Jews. Most of the prophets had a clear message to deliver, and delivered it with startling directness to unwilling hearers, who in the absence of argument replied with stones. The next generation, it is true, built the tombs of the prophets, and canonized their writings, but they rarely accepted their teaching. Thus neither Christian nor Jew could wholly accept the real meaning. Both were driven to unnatural, or, to use the polite expression, allegorical interpretations, which when skillfully used could be trusted to extract any meaning out of any passage in a manner equally incapable of confirmation or refutation. The writer of the Epistle of Barnabas was convinced that the Jewish interpretation of scripture was inspired by an evil spirit, and doubtless many Jewish teachers were convinced that his explanation of their divergence of opinion was right, though applied to the wrong side. In the exegetical game which ensued victory depended on the power to appoint the referee, and the players naturally nominated themselves.

The same situation constantly repeated itself, whenever there was controversy as to the meaning of Christian doctrine. Appeal was made to the letter of scripture, but no party could afford to give a consistently natural interpretation to every passage. This, indeed, could not be otherwise, seeing the possibility that scriptures could be inconsistent with each other was held to be excluded, though in fact they frequently were.

Nevertheless at the Reformation real progress was made. Luther laid down the rule that scripture must be interpreted in the light of grammar and history, not of ecclesiastical doctrine or authority. Professor Fullerton shows very clearly how important was this recognition, and how impossible it was for the Reformers to live up to it. The truth is—though he does not put it so baldly—that the Old Testament is a Jewish book and the New Testament a Catholic one. It is possible for the historians to convict both Jew and Catholic of occasional errors out of their own books, but in the main their books not unnaturally support them,—but the Protestant wrote neither Old nor New Testament, and his position is rarely confirmed by their meaning though based on their language.

Professor Fullerton tells the exact truth when he says that the use of "predictive prophecy" must be abandoned. The prophets were not infallible in their predictions; Jesus did not fulfill their predictions; and his use of prophecy as well as that of his followers is often inconsistent with its original meaning.

Nevertheless, Professor Fullerton thinks that we are still justified in saying that Jesus fulfilled prophecy "not because he is the fulfiller of prophetic predictions, but because he is the fulfiller of prophetic ideals." This raises a question which is constantly appearing in all modern theological controversy. May we use language in a wholly different sense from our fathers? "The rose by any other name would smell as sweet," but some of our theologians seem to think that this means that any other flower would be a rose, if it were named so, and that this process of giving old names to new opinions is a "restatement."

I do not suppose that Professor Fullerton is in sympathy with this tendency, which in its most marked forms is due to a congenital inability to think historically, but its infection is in the air, and most of us succumb to it at times. It is therefore merely a friendly criticism which asks whether it is not certain that Jesus and his contemporaries all believed in predictive prophecy, and that the phrase "fulfilling the ideals of the prophets rather than their predictions" would have meant little to them. The ideal of the prophets was in the main a better world, made better partly because men and women had learned to think, act, and speak as they ought, partly by the supernatural intervention of Jehovah. Jesus, in fact, was an individual, while the ideal of the prophets was a society. No doubt he looked to the same ideal as the prophets, but he was not that ideal himself. Nor can it truthfully be said that the society of Christians fulfills that ideal. Individual Christians have seen and approved the ideal seen by the prophets, but only as a land that is very far off. Is the Christian world that which Isaiah would approve? Is it not nearer the truth that Jesus was not the fulfillment of the prophets' ideal, or of the prophets' predictions, but one of their order, who having discharged a prophet's work received a prophet's reward?

K. L.

Ludwig Lewisohn's Criticism

The Modern Drama: an Essay in Interpretation, by L. Lewisohn. New York: B. W. Huebsch.

ONE reads this volume of criticism with that sort of infatuated attention whose origin is not respect which may be seen in the eyes of a caddie as he follows round the course the very worst golfer he has ever seen. It is one of the most amazing books ever published. It is a work of real scholarship, which gives an indefatigable survey of the modern theatre in France, England, and Germany, and turns a slow diligent stare at the more conspicuous of the Scandinavian dramatists; and it is apparent that the drama is the intellectual passion of Mr. Lewisohn's life. Yet it contains hardly a judgment on any playwright that does not make the reader's mental hair rise from the scalp; it is packed with analyses of plays which reveal that though Mr. Lewisohn has read every line of them he has not understood a single word of them; and every page makes it more and more apparent that Mr. Lewisohn in his devotion to the art of criticism is as amazing as a deaf man who should elect to spend his life going to concerts.

It is true, indeed, that Mr. Lewisohn is right on the subject of Mr. Henry Arthur Jones, whose popularity he rightly reckons as an indelible blot on the intellectual scutcheon of England. One welcomes any attack on those comedies, with their air of having been written by some not too nice-minded butler who spent his leisure weaving fantasies about the guests that came to the house and who had not been touched in his youth by that Popular Education which Mr. Jones attacks in his latest pamphlet in a way

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that shows he has no reason for prejudice on the subject. But almost everybody else provokes Mr. Lewisohn to what, though expressed with quiet consistency and in a sensible tone, is invariably the wild extremity of error. With the liberal gesture of one distributing largesse he spills his intellectual beans in every direction. Rosmersholm, that incomparable drama, appears to him "but slightly touched with Ibsen's finer qualities as a thinker and dramatic artist." He supports this judgment with an analysis of the play which would doubtless be quite an adequate analysis of some other play with another subject by a different author. Rosmerholm, as everyone ought to know, is one of the greatest plays ever written. It is the Hamlet of the revolutionary intellectual movement. It shows how those who battle for freedom against the old evils of slavery and stupidity may be led by their war, though it is holy, into curious places where out of contempt for those old evils they do violence to those old sanities and benevolences without which life cannot be lived, and so at the end meet a tarnished and dishonorable defeat, which yet is more honorable than abstinence from such warfare would have been. Its heroine is the one adequate presentation in all literature of a woman of genius, and the extremely disagreeable effect produced by the sight of the stigmata of genius (which include, as Ibsen handsomely admitted in The Master Builder, many exceedingly unpleasant characteristics) in a member of that sex which is expected to show unstained surfaces of amiability. Almost as wonderful as its illumination of the battle between revolution and conservatism is its satiric gaze at the attitude of men to women who show themselves possessed of power. For when Rosmer made Rebecca walk down the mill-race as penance for the wrong she had done his dead wife he was not merely fleeing back to his old faith and its conception of atonement; he was also feeling a certain satisfaction in taking a wild creature who had been threshing out new values for herself as females should not do and tying round her neck the steadying brick of a respectable moral symbol.

The play has, indeed, like every great work of art, important aspects and implications without number. The one thing, however, for which no reasonable person could mistake it is a crook drama. But that is Mr. Lewisohn's view of it. "The play derives its power from a traditional plot and a conventional motive—crime and its discovery, sin and its retribution;" and he compares it to its disadvantage with Hauptmann's Lonely Lives, which, although one cannot say of it as one can of his Das Friedenfest that it is one of the worst plays ever written in any language on any sphere in any universe, is wholly without genius. It is a tedious triangle play, in which most of the dramatic interest springs (as it so often does in Hauptmann) from collisions between the atrocious manners of the characters, and which in place of Rebecca puts a young woman who was apparently invented to prove that a minx is never so much a minx as when she is high-browed. To compare this piece of German carpentry with the bleak beauty of Ibsen is to commit suicide as a critic; but indeed while Mr. Lewisohn was writing this book he died daily in that sense. It is usually the merciful dispensation of Providence, who contrives on the whole that those who lose on the swings gain on the roundabouts, that those who are wrong about Ibsen are usually right about Wilde, and those who are wrong about Wilde are usually right about Ibsen. But Mr. Lewisohn is exempt from this merciful provision. Wilde is, of course, one of the most preposterously overrated personalities in modern literature. He was that saddest of things, a clever provincial who never fulfills the promise of youth because he came to London and found out how easily Londoners are amused. His work is tainted through and through with the unpardonable literary sin of idleness. His written epigrams were pat verbal summaries which disguised their cheap quality by an air of sophistication; only the proud sense of being a bad man saved him from writing "Laugh and the world laughs with you." His sensuous works are written in a kind of erotic Ollendorff in which one reads of the strange sins of the Sphinx instead of the penknife of the aunt. But just twice in his life before he went to prison he did some hard work and produced a masterpiece. One was The Soul of Man; the other was The Importance of Being Earnest. Both are visibly flawed by that lovelessness which is the peculiar quality of the class from which he came, the English garrison in Ireland; that refusal to flush with kindness, that preference for regarding one's fellowmen with contempt, which comes naturally to a community which is reared to look on those about them as born slaves with a heathenish religion. The Soul of Man is full of a love for the people which it is impossible to imagine inspiring any act of kindness toward any individual person. The Importance of Being Earnest has a cold drop of cruelty in its fun. But it is unquestionably the most perfect farce ever written. To Mr. Lewisohn, however, it seems a "mere farce, though of an airy and not quite graceless kind."

So he goes on: wrong about Shaw, wrong about Synge. And he crowns all by showing a new side of himself. As well as being a critic he is a translator. He alludes in his study of Rostand to "the really golden lyric" of Rudel in La Princesse Lointaine, and he translates it like this:

O Love supreme that burns
Hopeless of love's returns;
Tireless by night it yearns,
And day!
With such vain dreams that are
Loftier than life can mar
I love the Princess far
Away!

Now what Rudel really sings is this:

. . . . Car c'est chose suprême
D'aimer sans qu'on vous aime,
D'aimer toujours, quand même,
Sans cesse,
D'une amour incertaine,
Plus noble d'être vaine . . .
Et j'aime la lointaine
Princesse!

Car c'est chose divine
D'aimer lorsqu'on devine,
Rêve, invente, imagine
A peine . . . .
Le seul rêve interesse,
Vivre sans rêve, qu'est ce?
Et j'aime la Princesse
Lointaine!

Of course it was wrong of Rostand to write romantic poetry with so candid and industrious air of providing something for young men with sleek heads and white carnation buttonholes to read to ladies in Worth teagowns under pink lampshades after the tea and buttered muffins, but really he does not deserve this.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But indeed with Mr. Lewisohn's final conclusion that there are very few good plays we need not quarrel, though he reaches it by very strange ways. (One of his critical canons is that if a play is about a misalliance it must be bad if it approves of it and good if it disapproves.) But the assumption that this poverty of the stage is due simply to an uncritical audience, and that by educating the public to make a more fastidious demand one will automatically get a supply of good plays, seems, although one knows it is held by critics vastly superior to Mr. Lewisohn, to be unsound. It disregards one very important factor in the situation. Mr. Lewisohn is surely overlooking a significant clue when he writes of the lamentable decay which fell upon the English drama in the nineteenth century, and ascribes it to "the loss of a national sense for the theatre as a fine art," which is a phrase that simply begs the question, and to "the crushing weight of the Shakespearean tradition," which again begs the question, since old traditions linger obstructively in an art only when there are no new traditions to throw them out. Surely it is more than a coincidence that this decline in the drama should synchronize with the rise of the novel. Dickens, when he chose to write fiction instead of plays in spite of his passion for footlights and greasepaint, was typical of the writer of his time, who had discovered in the novel an art-form a thousand times more obedient and more flexible than the play can ever be. Detestable to the mind that can make a copy of the dawn in exquisite words to have to hand the job over to the scene-painter: cramping for one who has been accustomed to trail a story through the four seasons and round the globe to have to cabin it on the smallness of a stage, infuriating to the mind that can tell exactly in a single phrase how Mabel gave away the secret of her soul when she cast down her eyes to have to see Miss Mary Smith wrestling through weeks of rehearsal to get that effect with an unsuitable personality and koholed eyelashes; humiliating to the mind that could demonstrate that it too was a creator and omniscient about its creatures, by writing superhumanly intuitive pages about what passed in the heart of the young girl as she broke from the room and ran into the darkness, to have to bite it all back and set down "Exit Mabel L." In view of these real differences it is hard to understand why any author who is capable of writing a good novel should ever write a play; and, as the present state of dramatic literature shows, he usually doesn't.

For that reason it would seem impossible that the yield of good plays in any modern country should ever equal in quantity or quality its yield of good novels. But that is not to say there is no future for the theatre. There will always be a few literary minds which will be predisposed to the writing of plays by some peculiarity of temperament or circumstance. There will be writers like Mr. Granville Barker, who acquire the habit of thinking in terms of the stage from early education as an actor. And it is perhaps significant that nearly all the great masters of the English drama who have been faithful to the play since the rise of the novel—Sheridan, Wilde, Shaw, and Synge—have been Irish; that is, they belonged to a race so addicted to conversation that they started with a command over dialogue which it would have been a pity to waste on any other art-form. We will probably always have an Irish theatre. But it may happen that we are quite wrong in looking to men of letters for the maintenance of the drama. The Russian ballet, especially in what it has shown us of the invention of Massine, suggests that the real future of the stage lies in the work of imaginations not in the least of the literary kind. There are, after all, though we are inclined to forget it in this age of orgiastic printing, other arts as well as literature.

REBECCA WEST.

A Not Impossible Religion

A Not Impossible Religion, by Silvanus P. Thompson. New York: The John Lane Company.

THIS posthumous book is a collection of essays by a religiously minded scientist upon Christ, the early church and later theology. It is of interest rather for its author than for its content. Principal Thompson was a Professor of Physics, a past president both of the Physical Society and of the Optical Society, author of technical works on electricity and a past president of the Institution of Electrical Engineers, yet he found time to keep up his Greek and to follow carefully the work of recent New Testament scholarship. As its title indicates, the chief characteristic of the book is sanity. Its author sails just about a middle course between Scylla and Charybdis and finds the channel wide. The rock on the right is built of ugly masses of theology and ecclesiasticism. These he hates with holy hatred and never forgets "The Westminster Confession is as far from the gospel of the kingdom and from the gospel of the resurrection as is the Nicene Creed." The book has grown largely out of this just hatred. Unfortunately he is as unsympathetic with the twentieth as he is with the seventeenth century. He will not "applaud Bergson as if he were a second Plato." He does not approve of William James, nor is he interested in the fantastics of Mr. Bernard Shaw, the topsyturveydoms of Mr. Chesterton, the sonorous cadences of Omar Khayyam, the biting aphorisms of Nietzsche and the school-boy bulldogisms of Mr. Kipling." "In all this whirr and noise of today what single contribution is there of the smallest avail to the soul in conflict with itself?" But he does not deign to look further at this mud-flat on the left of his channel. He follows the splendid, though difficult, course of the modern Biblical critics and his reverence fills his sails. It is encouraging to see how completely their results commend themselves to his differently trained judgment; that is indeed the most significant feature of the book. With them he strips the figure of Christ of much of its legendary accretions and frankly admits his Jewish limitations. But with them also he finds "one clear episode of revelation, not to be explained away as mythical, but a fact of supremest import in the whole sweep of evolution, *the fact of Jesus Christ.*" By far the greatest part of the book is occupied with considerations of the creed, character, message, self-consciousness and discipleship of Christ. The author seems in close sympathy with the Society of Friends, and one wonders at the constant emphasis by a believer in the inward light upon the objective facts of history—at times he grazes most uncomfortably near the forbidden rock of theology—until toward the close of the volume the secret of his inner life discloses itself with charming delicacy and we find that for him Christ is not only revealer and herald but "comrade and partaker." Thus, then, does this earnest and modest student of the New Testament reconcile the objective and subjective elements of religion. For him, as for many another, "the Spirit clothed itself with" Christ.

As one lays the book aside one finds himself asking whether the men of the future will standardize their spiritual experiences by this constant reference to Jesus, whether

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Church will be able to direct the attention of youth to him so that they will in large numbers take time to disentangle Jesus of Nazareth from the Jesus of the Gospels and choose him as their comrade, or whether they will not rather trust themselves more spontaneously to those liberating impulses of the soul that so largely derive from him.

The book contains one or two keen historical suggestions and is so reverent toward the object of its study that save for an all too rare illustration the scientist is lost in the man. In spite of its discursiveness and faulty arrangement it is an interesting document of a passing stage in religious history, but a stage remarkably sincere and fruitful.

A. W. V.

Cheero

A London Lot, by A. Neil Lyons. New York: John Lane Co.

MR. NEIL LYONS is a realist who refuses to take himself seriously. He knows his London and he has a way of his own with it, but he uses London as a springboard to hilarity, with an occasional splash into sentiment. The amount of fresh fun in him is tremendous, even though he becomes more and more popular in his method. And under the fun, with all its conventionalizations, there is the subacidity of a man who hates pretense and detests pretentious people and genuinely loves the wild flowers of Cockaigne.

A London Lot takes in a coster, his girl and the war. When the war strikes the town of Silverside, Cuthbert Tunks is on the way to being (1) a fruit merchant, (2) local middle weight champion, (3) Cherry Walter's own. But he enlists, hating to be unfashionable, and he finds himself in a dugout, horribly lonely for Cherry and news of Cherry, long before the first year is over. Then up at the front, returning from a bombing party, he meets his former partner, Will Mooney and learns that his girl, who was left to run the business, is gone to hospital; and he goes wild. He had applied for leave with these intentions, "I shall touch my old man for a quid . . . two quid . . . free quid . . . and I shall go out, along o' my young lady, and I shall eat steak pudden and Welsh rabbit." At this declaration there were exclamations of approval; but Cuthbert, with a gesture, commanded silence, and continued his saga. "I shall see all the sights and smell all the smells there are in good old London. I shall drink port wine when I gits back to Blighty. R! And sherry wine and shandygaff and green Chartrey-ooze and rum and gin and whisky, old chappies—whort—whort? I shall ride in a taxi. I shall *'it a perliceman!'*" This "saga," as Neil Lyons calls it, is knocked silly by the sergeant. Cuth becomes filled with baulked disposition. He bolts from the front, lands on a hospital ship, becomes a famous case of "lost memory," and is only saved from disgrace in the end by the advocacy of Cherry Walters and the happy arrival and glorious presentation of his V. C.

This is obvious farce. But all through it and beyond it there is the consciousness that Neil Lyons is more than a farceur. He knows intimately and for himself the kind of man who hawks vegetables—he leaves to "the romantic pages of Punch" the old pearl-buttoned Phil May costermonger. He knows the places where these "merchants" live, the girls they love and the way they love them, and the sad little mokes they abuse and decorate. He knows the fathers and mothers, the alderman-landlord whom they hate and the terms on which they hate him. For him this is the real "saga" of London and the real source of his London pride. He has yielded to the war as a humorist may, but he has remained a light-hearted and warm-hearted lyricist of the Cockney.

Mummery

Mummery, by Gilbert Cannan. New York: George H. Doran Co.

IN Mummery it is Mr. Cannan's proposed object to make the theatre squirm—the theatre, that is, which ignores artists and playwrights of genius and fattens actor-managers until they swell into Falstaffs. If Beerbohm Tree were alive he might squirm at Sir Henry Butcher, manager and star of the "Imperium" theatre, whose egotism and bland greed are portrayed with happy cruelty. Mr. Cannan is entirely straightforward on the subject of the cheap and selfish actor-manager; it is his great and noble artists and playwrights that make one wonder if he really meant to burlesque them too.

The great artist Charles Mann and the prospective great actress Clara Day arrive together in London. He calls her "chicken." His great idea, long unexplained, is to design new scenery for the theatre and to start a school for actors. Besides assertions of the electrifying genius of Charles there are no further evidences of it, except that when his first wife turns up after he has married Clara he explains he had entirely forgotten this woman. And, besides, he couldn't bear to mention it. "You were so happy, chicken, so was I. I hadn't been happy before, not like that." Clara freely forgives the great vague genius, but still she moves away. Incidentally, almost irrelevantly, she has become a great actress.

A few platonically indefinite friendships intervene, and then, in a bookshop, she meets Adnor Rodd. He is a proudly unpublished dramatist whose genius breaks one's heart, it is so inexpressible and unexpressed. So is his joy at the first sight of Clara. "As they stood gazing at each other the bookshop vanished, London disappeared, there was nothing but they two on all the earth. Neither could move."

Clara eventually moves. She leaves the stage. They get married.—Except for the all-too-real Sir Henry Butcher, Mummery is a study in vehement generalities, and the cautious reader can only say that if Mr. Cannan made it banal on purpose he shouldn't have done it so well.

The Disabled Soldier

The Disabled Soldier, by Douglas C. McMurtrie. New York: The Macmillan Co.

THERE is evident a very genuine desire on the part of the public to help in putting the disabled soldier back on his feet. Coupled with this, however, there is just as genuine a bewilderment as to what is the best way of going about it. People want to know just what is being done for the crippled soldier, and how far they should let their natural sympathies guide them in dealing with him. There has been all too little written about this very vital subject, and yet it is eminently to the interest of society as a whole, and the disabled man in particular, that every man and woman should be acquainted with the bare outlines of the problem of rehabilitation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is to just such a wide public that Mr. McMurtrie's book is addressed, and it is admirably adapted to convey the information. Although written by an expert—Douglas C. McMurtrie has been for years identified with the social and economic interests of the disabled, and is at present director of the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men—it is noteworthy that the book is entirely free from technicalities. A further advantage for the general reader is its brevity. Within the comparatively short space of 232 pages is compressed a wealth of information. No one can read The Disabled Soldier without having a clear idea of the main principles which have been evolved in the science of rehabilitation. The treatment in a book of this size can only be rapid, but within its limitations it is thorough and accurate.

Mr. McMurtrie traces the process of rehabilitation from the time the man enters the reconstruction hospital and passes to the vocational school, to the time when he is actually placed in a job. The chapter, At Work Again, will be of particular interest to employers of labor. The provision for reeducation made by all of the belligerent nations is reviewed, and there is a chapter descriptive of the various types of disablement, such as amputations, blindness, deafness, shell shock, tuberculosis. The meat of the book, however, is to be found in the chapters dealing with vocational training and placement in industry. The volume is illustrated with remarkable photographs of men, with one, two, and in some cases, three artificial limbs, performing their daily work.

Mr. McMurtrie's is a message of cheer to those people who are inclined to consider disablement a greater calamity than even death. "For even the most seriously disabled cases," he says, "well paid jobs can be found . . . The plan of reeducation is to train a man for a job in which he can perform one hundred per cent. efficiently in spite of his handicap, to find a process in the performance of which the disability will be no drawback whatever. With the wide variety of industrial processes today, it is entirely possible to find specific jobs which men with all types of handicap can follow."

The actual work of putting the American soldier back on his feet is in its infancy, but the United States has made a good start in the problem of rehabilitation. With the examples of the other nations before her, she should improve on their methods and learn from their mistakes. But after all, however perfect a national system of rehabilitation may be, it depends in the final analysis upon the reaction of those with whom the disabled soldier comes in contact. Successful cripples are unanimous in saying that the greatest handicap is not a loss of limb, but the weight of public opinion.

As Mr. McMurtrie says, the success of the work rests with the people of the United States. The open road is before us, and on that road a book such as this should prove a most valuable signpost. KATHLEEN GOLDSMITH.

Contributors

JAMES W. LINN, is professor of English at the University of Chicago and the author of The Second Generation and The Chameleon.

THE REV. JAMES THAYER ADDISON, is assistant professor of the History of Religion and Missions at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. During 1909-10 he was assistant professor of philosophy at St. John's University, Shanghai, and for the last ten years has been a student of Far Eastern politics.

Are the Christian Churches About to Unite?

APPROACHES TOWARDS CHURCH UNITY

By

Newman Smyth, and Williston Walker.

With chapters by Bishop Brent and Raymond Calkins.

As a result of the war the question of uniting the Christian churches has become a vital part of reconstruction. Here is a clear, noncontroversial discussion of this imperative subject.

Cloth 170 Pages $1.25

YALE TALKS

By Charles Reynolds Brown

Dean of the School of Religion, Yale University.

Delivered at the leading eastern colleges,—a discussion of the mode of life and the purposes which should govern any young man.

Paper Boards 156 Pages $1.00

CHIMNEY-POT PAPERS

By Charles S. Brooks

A series of light essays on genial subjects. "A book fair to the eye and pleasant to the mind."—The Outlook.

Paper boards, cloth back 184 Pages $2.00

Uniform in style with other works of Brooks already published:

Journeys to Bagdad $2.00

There's Pippins and Cheese to Come $2.00

SWEDEN'S LAUREATE

Selected Poems of Verner von Heidenstam

Translated, with an Introduction, by Charles Wharton Stork

Verner von Heidenstam won the Nobel Prize in 1916. He has been called the greatest living patriotic poet.

Paper boards, cloth back 159 Pages $1.35

THE WAR AND PREACHING

By John Kelman

Lectures delivered before the Yale School of Religion dealing with the influence of the war on the Christian faith. Dr. Kelman brings back his fine philosophy from his own experiences in the trenches.

Paper boards 216 Pages $1.25

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

New Haven, Connecticut

280 Madison Avenue, New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Children's School

For boys and girls from 2 to 10 years

The Children's School attempts to create an all-day all-round life for the city child, through modern educational methods based on fundamental sources of thought and action. It strives to relate the necessary studies directly to the life of the normal child, so that reading, writing, arithmetic, history, and geography do not seem tasks superimposed on him, but appeal to him as natural and interesting accompaniments of his unfolding world.

The school plan embraces all-day activities, hot lunches, afternoon trips. There is a large double-roof playground, carpentry shops, an auditorium for music and dancing. Curriculum includes outdoor nature study, modeling and drawing, spoken French, science. The children are developed in small groups to assure a maximum of personal attention. The activities of the younger groups are carried on largely out of doors.

The teaching staff consists of carefully selected specialists in their several fields. It includes Dr. Hendrik Willem Van Loon, the historian, formerly Lecturer in History at Cornell University, and M. Ernest Bloch, the noted Swiss composer.

Write for booklet.

MARGARET NAUMBURG, *Director*

32-34 West 68th Street New York City

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

Brentano's
NEW YORK
5th Ave at 27th St.
Booksellers to the World
All Books All Languages

Truth vs. Propaganda

Two Pamphlets

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE PROPOSED DISMEMBERMENT OF HUNGARY

With a Map, Statistical Table and Two Appendices

BY EUGENE PIVÁNY

Price 25 cents

RUMANIA IN HUNGARY

Her Conduct During the War
Her Conduct During the "Armistice"
Her Territorial Claims

BY EUGENE PIVÁNY Price 10 cents

HUNGARIAN AMERICAN FEDERATION
404 Superior Building, Cleveland, Ohio

With letters from Mr. Hoover and on invitation of the English and American Society of Friends

MISS JANE ADDAMS
DR. ALICE HAMILTON

SPENT JULY IN GERMANY

Their impressions of food conditions there are brought out in a remarkable human document in the **September Reconstruction Number of the Survey.**

TO NEW REPUBLIC READERS

Six of these illustrated monthly Reconstruction Numbers $1.

A School for the New Republic

Prepare the new generation for the new era.
"From life thru life to life."

The method of true education is *functional*—learning comes as by-product of *doing*—with the germ of practical life.
It is *compelling*—rests on fundamental interests and points to the achievement of human purposes.
It will *enkindle*—reduce convention and tradition and implant a spirit of constructive discontent.
Its process must be coöperative and democratic; no instilling of fixed ideas, no exaltation of teacher above learner, no establishment of personal authority; but the whole group must keep the spirit of youth and learn in coöperative fellowship.
This spirit of our school will be universalized in a new social order, a commonwealth whose interest shall be to enhance personality thru democratic participation in the essential works of life.

Liberty Industrial Farm Training-school

Co-ed. Kindergarten to college grades. Non-sectarian, 1,000 acres of farm and forest—high, healthful, scenic.

MRS. S. SIMPSON, Registrar, Dwight, Mass.

Sargent's Handbook of

AMERICAN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

A Guide Book for Parents

A Standard Annual of Reference. Describes critically and discriminately the Private Schools of all classifications.

Introductory Chapters review interesting developments of the year.

Our Educational Service Bureau will be glad to advise and write you ultimately about any school or class of schools.

Fifth edition*, 1919, *revised and enlarged*, 768 pp., $3. *Circulars and sample pages on request.

PORTER E. SARGENT

14 Beacon Street Boston, Mass.

DONGAN HALL

Dongan Hills, Staten Island, New York

A New Boarding and Country Day School for Girls

340 feet elevation. 13 acres. 50 minutes from New York City

College Preparatory and General Courses. Art, Music, Domestic Economy, Manual Training, Athletics, Riding. Remarkably beautiful and healthful surroundings. A school which combines the development of ideals, practical training of permanent value, and a high standard of scholarship.

ADA S. BLAKE, Principal.

Secretarial position wanted by young woman. Competent stenographer thoroughly conversant with business administration. Professional and educational work. Capable assuming responsible position where initiative, tact and personality are required.

Reply Box 82.
NEW REPUBLIC, 421 W. 21st St.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED